DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 678 TM 004 950

TITLE	Evaluation of Title I ESEA Projects: 1975-76.
INSTITUTION	Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	157p.; For a related document, see TM 004 886
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$8.24 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Program Evaluation; *School Districts
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; Pennsylvania (Philadelphia); Philadelphia School District

ABSTRACT

Evaluation services to be provided during 1975-76 to projects funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I are listed in this annual booklet. For each project, the following information is provided: goals to be assessed, evaluation techniques (design), and evaluation milestones. Regular term and summer term projects reported on are: affective education, alternative programs, Benchmark, bilingual education, comprehensive math project, comprehensive reading project, computer managed instruction, counseling services, creative dramatics, education in world affairs, English as a second language readiness, English to speakers of other languages, Follow Through, institutions for neglected and delinquent children, learning centers project, meet the artist, motivation, multimedia center, out of school sequenced science experiences, school community coordinators, speech and hearing. Walnut Center, and young audiences. (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED115678

ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

TITLE I

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

1975-1976

EVALUATION

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

MICHAEL P MARCASE, Superintendent

TM004 950

EVALUATION OF TITLE I
ESEA PROJECTS
1975-1976

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Michael P. Marcase

Executive Deputy Superintendent
Dr. Robert L. Poindexter

Associate Superintendent for School Services
Mr. David A. Horowitz

Office of Federal Programs
Mr. Thomas C. Rosica, Executive Director

Office of Research and Evaluation

Dr. Michael H. Kean, Executive Director
Dr. Stephen H. Davidoff, Assistant Director, Federal Evaluation Resource Services

Members of the Board of Education

Mr. Arthur W. Thomas, President
Mrs. Edward Oberholtzer, Vice President
Mr. Augustus Baxter
Mrs. Lawrence I. Boonin
Dr. Philip Davidoff
Mr. George Hutt
Dr. Alec Washco, Jr.

CONTENTS

DISTRICT CREDITS

INTRODUCTION: TITLE I EVALUATION SERVICES 1975-1976
Stephen H. Davidoff

EVALUATION BLUEPRINTS (DESIGNS)

REGULAR TERM

- Affective Education 5
- Alternative Programs 9
- Benchmark 11
- Bilingual Education 13
- Comprehensive Math Project 17
- Comprehensive Reading Project
  - Aide Services 25
  - District Reading Projects (Districts 1 through 7) 33
  - Improvement of Reading Skills (A and B) 51
  - Improvement of Reading Skills (C) 53
  - Individualized Education Center 55
  - Operation Individual 57
  - Primary Reading Skills Center 61
  - Reading Improvement Through Teacher Education 63
- Computer Managed Instruction 67
- Counseling Services 69
- Creative Dramatics 73
- Education in World Affairs 75
- English as a Second Language Readiness 77
- English to Speakers of Other Languages 79
- Follow Through 81
- Institutions for Neglected and Delinquent Children 87
- Learning Centers Project 89
- Meet the Artist 91
- Motivation 93
- Multi-Media Center 95
- Out of School Sequenced Science Experiences 97
- School Community Coordinators 99
- Speech and Hearing 101
- Walnut Center 103
- Young Audiences 105

SUMMER TERM

Affective Education 109
Benchmark 111
Bilingual Education Project 113
Comprehensive Mathematics Project 115
Comprehensive Reading Project
    Aide Services (Part B) 117
    District Reading Projects (Districts 1 through 7) 119
    Language Arts Reading Camps 131
    Summer Reading Readiness 133
Computer Managed Instruction Project 135
Counseling Services Project 137
English to Speakers of Other Languages 139
Follow Through Project 141
Institution for Neglected and Delinquent Children Project 143
Learning Centers Project 145
Meet the Artist 147
Motivation 149
Multi-Media Center Project 151
School Community Coordinators 153
Summer Special Education Project 155
Walnut Center Project 157

ADDENDUM

Intensive Reading for Secondary Students 161

INTRODUCTION

Since 1968, the Office of Research and Evaluation has annually published a booklet containing the evaluation services to be provided during the year to projects funded under ESEA Title I.

The major goals of the Title I Evaluation unit are:

1. To conduct evaluations of all Title I projects.
2. To provide interim and final reports containing evaluation findings and to disseminate these materials to specified decision makers and to the State Department of Education.
3. To provide direct services to the staff of the Office of Federal Programs by assessing the educational needs of Title I children, and by assisting in the preparation of Title I proposals.
4. To provide consulting services in the areas of evaluation design, data analysis, and test construction to Title I project directors and to central staff.

Evaluation teams are responsible for the evaluation of projects funded under ESEA Title I. They participate in all phases of the evaluation process from the development of the evaluation design to the production of final reports. An ongoing needs assessment is conducted using accepted methodology in compliance with the requirements of the Title I Act. The results of these assessments are directly related to the objectives of the projects. In turn, a specific procedure has been designated in the proposal for the measurement of each stated objective.

Consistent with what is methodologically possible, criteria for success and failure are explicitly stated and include measurable objectives, instruments to be used for determining the extent to which each objective is, or is not met, and the plan for analyzing data collected. A final report of the findings of the evaluation of Title I programs will be prepared by the Office of Research and Evaluation.

This complete report will then be reviewed by the Associate Superintendent for School Services, District Superintendents, the Title I Parents' Advisory Group, the Executive Director of Federal Programs, and the Pennsylvania Department of Education. This final report will be used by a joint committee of reviewers from the LEA as a basis for recommendations for project modifications and reallocation of resources.

REGULAR TERM PROJECTS

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Affective Education (R) **(PBRS #**611-64-611 **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Norman Newberg **PROJECT EVALUATOR:** William E. Loue III **INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:** 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK OBJECTIVES

Teacher Objective

a. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the teachers participating for the first year in the communications network training program will implement, in their classrooms, one communications network project-approach to reading and/or writing for a minimum of six (6) weeks during the five-month period January through May, 1976. Verification of the attainment of this objective will be accomplished by (1) on-site monitoring by the evaluator and (2) submission of a report by May 1, 1976 by each participating teacher which includes (a) a description of the communications network project offered; (b) the schedule; (c) the project lesson plans and; (d) completed Student Feedback Summary Forms.

Student Objectives

b. On the vocabulary and comprehension subtests of The Gates MacGinitie Reading Test, students in grades 3-6 participating in classrooms taught by teachers who have completed more than 40 hours of first-year communications network training and are continuing in second-year communications network training will attain reading achievement scores which are significantly better ($p<.10$) than those attained by a comparison group in non-communications network classrooms in their respective schools.

c. On the Sustained-Silent-Reading-Eye-Contact Frequency Checklist, students in grades 3-6 participating in classrooms taught by teachers who have completed 40 hours of first year communications network training will attain reading-tasks-persistence scores which are significantly better ($p<.10$) than those attained by a comparison group in their respective schools.

d. On a Picture Stimulus Test, students in Grades 3-6 participating in classrooms taught by teachers who have completed 40 hours of first year communications network training and continuing in second year communications network training will attain writing-competence scores which are significantly better ($p<.10$) than those attained by a comparison group in non-communications network classrooms in their respective schools.

e. On The Picture Stimulus Test students in Grades 3-6 participating in classrooms taught by teachers who have completed more than 40 hours of first year communications network training and are continuing in second year communications network training will attain writing-willingness scores which are significantly better than those attained by a comparison group ($p<.10$) in non-communications network classrooms in their respective schools.

f. On the Crandall Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire, students in Grades 4-6 participating in classrooms taught by teachers who have had 40 hours of first year communications network training and are continuing in second year communications network training will attain achievement-responsibility scores which are significantly better ($p<.10$) than those attained by a comparison group in non-communications network classrooms in their respective schools.

Resource Services Objective

g. On a locally developed attitude survey, fifty percent (50%) of the students in classrooms in two schools taught by teachers who have received a minimum of fifteen (15) hours of affective education training will report more positive attitudes in May, 1976 toward the academic area than they reported in November 1975.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a. The number and percent of teachers participating for the first time in the communications network training program who implement a communications network project-approach to reading and/or writing for a minimum of six weeks during the five month period January through May, 1976 will be verified by (1) evaluation observation of 75% of the first year communication network teachers (approximately 20), (2) the submission of a report no later than May 15, 1976 by each first year communications network teacher which includes: (a) a description of the implemented project, (b) a schedule including dates and duration each time the project was offered, (c) a complete set of lesson plans and, (d) completed Student Feedback Summary Forms.

b. The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Primary C for third grade students and Sur[illegible] D, reading vocabulary and comprehension only for grades 4-6) will be administered [illegible] May, 1976 to students in 10 second year communications network classrooms and 10 [illegible]parison groups selected from the same schools. The communications network classro[illegible] sample represents approximately 50% of the total second year communications network classrooms. The Comparison groups will be selected on the basis of similarity in their 1975 California Achievement Test (reading vocabulary and comprehension subtests) scores to these same test scores of students in communications network classrooms. A t test of significance will be applied.

c. The Sustained Silent Reading Eye Contact Frequency Checklist will be used by the evaluator during March and April, 1976. Twenty-five elementary students in second year communications network classrooms and 25 elementary students in comparison classrooms will be observed each for a measured period of five minutes of sustained silent reading. Students in communications network classrooms and non-communications network classrooms will be drawn from the same schools and selected on the basis of similarity in their 1975 California Achievement Test reading vocabulary and comprehension scores. The number of reading eye contacts in a five minute period will be determined for each student and a mean determined for each group. A t test of significance will be applied.

d. The Picture Stimulus Test will be administered in April, 1976 to students in five second year communications network classrooms and to students in five comparison groups from the same schools. The communications network classroom sample represents approximately 25% of the total second year communications network classrooms. Students in communications network classrooms and non-communications network classrooms will be selected on the basis of similarity in their 1975 California Achievement Test reading vocabulary and comprehension scores. The number of complete sentences, number of correctly spelled nouns and verbs, number of compound sentences and number of conjunctions in each writing sample will be counted. A mean for each group will be determined. A t test of analysis will be applied.

e. The Picture Stimulus Test will be administered in April, 1976 to students in five second year communications network classrooms and to students in five comparison groups from the same schools. The communication network classroom sample represents approximately 25% of the total of the second year communications network classrooms. Students in communications network classrooms and non-communication network classrooms will be selected on the basis of similarity in their 1975 California Achievement Test reading vocabulary and comprehension scores. The number of words written in response to the fixed picture stimulus will be computed and a mean determined for each group. A t test of significance will be applied.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

f. The Crandall Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire will be administered in April, 1976 to students in five second year communications network classrooms and to students in five comparison groups from the same schools. The communications network sample represents approximately 25% of the total second year communications network classrooms. Students in communication network classrooms and non-communication classrooms will be selected on the basis of similarity in their 1975 California Achievement Test reading vocabulary and comprehension scores. A Chi-Square test of Analysis will be applied.

g. A locally developed attitude survey will be administered in November 1975 and May 1976 to students in affective classrooms in two schools. The number and percent of students reporting a more positive attitude toward a specific academic area in May than that reported in November will be recorded.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered					G									
5. Monitoring of Project				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed											✓			
9. Post-Measures Administered										B,C D	A,F G			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓		✓
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Alternative Programs **(PBRS #** 611-03,04-539**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Leonard B. Finkelstein

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Roger J. Fishman, B. David Wasserman

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. For those programs that designate dropout prevention as a major emphasis, 50% or more of the participating students will be graduated from high school as measured by the Alternative Program Student Record Form (APSR).

B. To increase student satisfaction with school in those programs where attendance, behavior, and/or teacher-assigned grades are formal objectives as indicated by (1) an improvement in the attendance of 60% of the students in the programs, (2) an improvement in behavior ratings of 75% of the students in the programs, and (3) a 50% decrease in the number of students in the programs receiving unsatisfactory performance ratings in the major subjects as measured by the APSR.

C. To create positive attitudes toward school as indicated by a positive mean score on the Alternative Programs Student Questionnaire.

D. To promote the general satisfaction of teachers with their alternative programs as indicated by a positive mean response on the Alternative Programs Teacher Questionnaire.

E. To promote the general satisfaction of parents whose children attend alternative programs as indicated by responses to a telephone survey for a representative sample. Seventy percent of the parents surveyed will report satisfaction with their children's education.

F. Sixty percent of the participating students will maintain or increase their achievement levels as indicated by changes in their National Percentile Ranks on the California Achievement Tests from 1975 to 1976.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A. The Alternative Programs Student Record form will be distributed to each alternative program in the fall so that complete information can be supplied throughout the school year as students enter and exit from the programs. All forms will be returned in June.

B. These data will be collected through the use of the Alternative Programs Student Record form (See A).

C. The Alternative Programs Student Questionnaire examines students' attitudes toward curriculum and instruction, teachers, peers, and their programs. This instrument will be administered in January, although programs will have the option of additional administrations. Where appropriate, comparison data will be obtained. Thus a one-shot case study or a posttest-only control group design will be used.

D. The Alternative Programs Teacher Questionnaire will be administered in January and, upon request, at other times during the school year. Factors measured include Implementation, Time and Strain, Physical Support, Curriculum and Instruction, and External Communication. The evaluation design is the one-shot case study.

E. A telephone survey of alternative program students' parents will be conducted during February. This survey was developed during the 1974-75 school year and will be revised for future usage.

F. The California Achievement Test is administered by the School District in a citywide testing program. The one-group pretest-posttest design is to be utilized.

G. Onsite, formative evaluation services will be provided for a sample of the alternative programs. This procedure will result in the development of evaluation notebooks which will detail each program's progress on the general Title I objectives as well as on a number of areas that may be program-specific. In addition, instrument development and data analysis services will be provided on a request basis.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted														
4. Premeasures Administered	N/A													
5. Monitoring of Project				G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G			
6. Mid-Measures Administered	N/A													
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed												✓		
9. Post-Measures Administered							C* D*	E* F ✓				A B		
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev													✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

A., B. Preslugging of forms for distribution; update current file; additional programming for longitudinal analysis.
C. Scanning, ITEMRS
D. Scanning, ITEMRS
F. ID match & merge; analyses by program & student.
G. Scanning, ITEMRS

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: BENCHMARK (R) **(PBRS #**611-02-507**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Edmund Forte

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Arnold Escourt

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. By the end of the school year 50% of the pupils with 80% attendance will achieve 90% mastery of the word-recognition skills measured by the Phonics Inventory A and B.

B. By the end of the school year 70% of the pupils with 80% attendance will gain the reading skills of one book level as measured by teacher scoring of an Individual Reading Inventory.

C. By the end of the school year 60% of the pupils with 80% attendance will gain one level as measured by the Philadelphia Mathematics Evaluation Tests.

D. At least 60% of the parents of children enrolled in the project will show concern and interest by (a) visiting the school, (b) volunteering their time, (c) assisting with homework, (d) contacting the teacher, or (e) introducing the pupil to new educational experiences, as measured by teacher records.

E. Each Benchmark teacher will be assisted by one aide during all classroom instruction. The Evaluation Team will observe aides active in reviewing material, marking papers, distributing and collecting materials, keeping records for small groups and individual pupils, and assisting individuals and groups with review or reinforcement activities as recorded on the Observational Checklist.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A pre-post evaluation study will be conducted. The pretesting process will provide baseline data for the project and diagnostic data for the teacher. The data will indicate starting points for instruction and allow the teachers to focus on areas for review and concentration of efforts. The instructional process will be monitored using the Observational Checklist and by evaluators knowledgeable in the process. Posttests will be utilized to ascertain individual pupil gains, and group achievement.

Instruments to be used in the pre- and posttesting process are:

The Phonics Inventory A and B, individual Reading Inventories, and the Philadelphia Mathematics Evaluation Tests.

The California Achievement Tests will be administered in February to provide measures of growth after one year of project implementation.

Teachers will maintain records of parents volunteering their services, or contacting them. A questionnaire will be developed to determine parental assistance with homework or exposure to new educational experiences.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓			
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered			b (3)											
5. Monitoring of Project				✓			✓			✓				
6. Mid-Measures Administered								✓						
7. Interim Report								✓						
8. Monitoring Completed											✓			
9. Post-Measures Administered											✓			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev													✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Bilingual Education (R) **(PBRS #** 611-06-538**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Charles McLaughlin **PROJECT EVALUATOR:** Marion Kaplan **INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:** 2

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. Carino Center pupils will increase their instructional reading levels to the extent that, between the September pretest and the May posttest, 75% of them will gain at least one book level on a group Informal Reading Inventory.

B. Cariño Center pupils will increase in mathematics achievement to the extent that, for each selected subtest of the Key Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Test, 85% of the students, on the May posttest, will exceed their September pretest score by an amount greater than the product of the standard error of the difference for two parallel measures and the critical value for significance ($p<.05$).

C. Cariño Center pupils will increase their reading achievement levels to the extent that, between the September pretest and the May posttest, there will be a significant gain ($p<.05$) in average raw score on each level of the Interamerican Series Tests of Reading.

D. Pupils receiving full-day service from the Bilingual Education auxiliary teachers in the feeder schools will increase their instructional reading levels to the extent that, between the September pretest and the May posttest, 75% of the pupils will gain at least one book level on a group Informal Reading Inventory.

E. Pupils receiving full-day service from the Bilingual Education auxiliary teachers in the feeder schools will increase in mathematics achievement to the extent that, for each selected subtest of the Key Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Test, 85% of the students, on the May posttest, will exceed their September pretest score by an amount equal to the product of the standard error of the difference for two parallel measures and the critical value for significance ($p<.05$).

F. Pupils receiving remedial service from the Bilingual Education auxiliary teachers in the feeder schools will improve in basic skills to the extent that, by the end of the school year, 80% of them will master 90% of the specific skills for which they were referred. This will be determined by examination of teacher records.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A. A group Informal Reading Inventory will be administered to all Cariño Center pupils in September and May. The number and percentage of pupils gaining one or more book levels will be calculated. The result will be compared with the stated criterion.

B. Selected subtests of the Key Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Test will be administered to all Cariño Center pupils in September and May. To determine if a pupil has met the criterion for gain, the following procedures will be employed for each subtest.

1. Using the publisher's standard error of measurement, the standard error of difference (for two parallel measures) will be calculated.
2. This quantity will be multiplied by the critical value for $p<.05$ to obtain a criterion of gain for the specific subtest.
3. Each pupil's pretest score will be subtracted from his posttest score to determine his obtained gain.
4. The obtained gain (for each pupil) will be compared with the criterion of gain.

The percentage of students whose obtained gains exceed the criterion of gain on all administered subtests will be calculated and compared with the expectation of having 85% of the students gain on all subtests.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed			✓											
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered			ABC DE			F								
5. Monitoring of Project				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed										✓				
9. Post-Measures Administered											ABC DEF			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓	✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed													✓	

***=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.**

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

Assistance with the selection of a Bilingual screening test.

C. The Interamerican Series Tests of Reading will be administered to all Cariño Center pupils will be administered in September and May. For each level of the test, mean pretest and mean posttest scores will be calculated and compared using Sandlers A-statistic ($p<.05$).

D. A group Informal Reading Inventory will be administered to all pupils receiving full-day service from the auxiliary teachers. Procedures will be similar to those described under A.

E. Selected subtests of the Key Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Test will be administered to all pupils receiving full-day service from the auxiliary teachers. Procedures will be similar to those described under B.

F. For each pupil receiving remedial services, the auxiliary teacher will maintain a progress record. This record will state the skill(s) for which the pupil was referred, the date of entry, the nature of instruction provided, and the degree of remediation. Evaluators will examine these records in December and May. Data from these records will be compiled and compared with the stated criterion (80% of the students mastering 90% of the specific skills).

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE MATH A - Elementary Resources Teacher Program
A Component of the Comprehensive Mathematics Program (R)
(PBRS #Pending)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Alex Tobin

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Arnold Escourt

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. During the school year targeted pupils will show an average gain of two instructional mathematics levels as indicated by scores of the Philadelphia Mathematics Evaluation Tests administered in the Fall and Spring.

b. During the period February to February (when city-wide tests are given) the percentage of targeted pupils in Grades 1-6 below the 16th percentile will be reduced by 3%.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A pre-post design supported by observation by the evaluation team and project coordinator will be utilzed. The sample will include a minimum of 30% of the targeted pupils.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted		✓												
4. Premeasures Administered			a	a										
5. Monitoring of Project				✓		✓		✓		✓				
6. Mid-Measures Administered N/A														
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed											✓			
9. Post-Measures Administered								b		a	a			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓	✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE MATH B - Junior High/Middle School Mathematics Specialist Program - Component of Comprehensive Math Program(R) **(PBRS #**Pending **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Alex Tobin

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Arnold Escourt

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. During the school year 60% of the eligible pupils in middle and junior high schools will raise their mathematics achievement by one level as measured by the Philadelphia Mathematics Evaluation Test.

b. Each eligible middle and junior high school will have an assigned Mathematics Specialist Teacher who will provide on-going staff development to teachers of Title I children, and use 40% of his available time to provide remediation help to pupils identified as having the greatest need as indicated by teacher records and observations conducted by the evaluation team using the Observational Checklist.

c. Each Mathematics Specialist Teacher will serve as a resource to Title I teachers to implement a comprehensive "mathematics levels" program through Year 9 as indicated by observations of the project coordinator and school administration staff as reported on the Comprehensive Mathematics Survey Form.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

Comprehensive Math B - Junior High/Middle School Mathematics Specialist Program

. A pre-post design augmented by visitation and observation by the project coordinator and evaluation team will be utilized. Pretest assessment scores will be compared to posttest results (Philadelphia Math Evaluation Tests). Data will be tabulated and frequency tables developed.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓		✓				✓							
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted		✓												
4. Premeasures Administered			a	a										
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered N/A				b		b		b		b				
7. Interim Report						✓								
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered										a	a			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓	✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

***=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.**

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE MATH C-Tenth Grade Mathematics Specialist Program A component of the Comprehensive Math Program (R) **(PBRS #** Pending **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Alex Tobin

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Arnold Escourt

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. During the period between the pretest and posttest using the Math Computation subtest of the CAT level 5 eligible pupils in the tenth grade (scoring at the 16th percentile or below) will increase their scores with a median gain of two percentile points.

b. Eligible pupils will be rostered to five (5) periods of Mathematics instruction per week in a class with a maximum of 25 pupils as indicated by the school records and observations by the Evaluation team.

c. Eligible schools will have an assigned 10th-grade Mathematics Specialist Teacher who will provide ongoing staff development for teachers of Title I pupils, and will utilize 40% of their rostered time to remediate selected pupils as indicated by the project coordinator's report and observations made by the evaluation team.

Comprehensive Math C - Mathematics Skill Center Program for Eleventh and Twelfth Grades

d. A Mathematics Skill Center Teacher (Grades 11 and 12) and a Mathematics Skill Center Aide will be provided for each eligible senior high school as indicated by personnel records and site observation.

e. The Mathematics Skill Center Teacher will (a) provide individualized instruction to eligible pupils in the 11th and 12th grades, (b) provide diagnosis and individual prescription for each participating pupil, and (c) maintain achievement and attendance records for each participating pupil. These activities will be observed and monitored by the project coordinator and the evaluation team using the Observational Checklist.

f. The Skill Center Aide will be observed by the Evaluation Team which will use the Observational Form. The Aide will assist the teacher in the room by (a) marking papers, and filling in records, (b) storing and maintaining instructional materials, (c) reviewing material with pupils or tutoring pupils, or (d) performing needed clerical or housekeeping tasks during periods of classroom instruction.

g. During the school year, eligible students who attend the Mathematics Skill Center 70% of the time requested by the Center's teacher as indicated by the teacher records will make a 20% gain in the number of items correct on the computation section of the Level 5 California Achievement Tests administered in the Fall and Spring.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

Tenth Grade Mathematics Specialist Program

- A pre-post monitoring process will be utilized. The CAT level 5 computation sub-test will be used to screen pupils for this program. The posttest gains will be used to evaluate pupil achievement.

- Classroom visitation and observations will be completed during the year by the program coordinator and project evaluation team.

- The Mathematics Specialist will maintain up-to-date records of pupil attendance and accomplishments for students participating in his remedial groups.

Comprehensive Math C - Mathematics Skills Center Program for Eleventh-and Twelfth-Grade Pupils in Title I Senior High Schools

- A pre-post monitoring design will be adopted. Pupils will be pretested with the Level 5 CAT for determination of pupil need. Posttests will be used to measure growth. Teachers will maintain up-to-date records of pupil attendance, achievement, and progress through the program.

- Classroom visitations will be conducted periodically by the Program Coordinator and project evaluation team.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted		✓												
4. Premeasures Administered			a-g											
5. Monitoring of Project				bcef		bcef		bcef		bcef				
6. Mid-Measures Administered N/A														
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered											a-g			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓		
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE MATH - D -Activity-Centered Mathematics for Retarded Educable Children
A Component of Comprehensive Math Program (R)

(PBRS # Pending **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Alex Tobin

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Arnold Escourt

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

1. During the school year pupils will achieve an average growth of five (5) months in the area of CONTENT, APPLICATIONS, and OPERATIONS AS MEASURED BY THE KEY MATH DIAGNOSTIC ARITHMETIC TEST administered in the Fall and Spring.

2. Fifty percent of the teachers will maintain or improve their attitudes toward the teaching of mathematics as measured by the YOA AYERS TOBIN (YAT) ATTITUDE TOWARD MATHEMATICS TEST administered in the Spring.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

- All children participating in the program will be pretested and posttested with the Key Mathematics Diagnostic Arithmetic Test published by American Guidance Service for the purpose of measuring growth in mathematical achievement.
- The YOA AYERS TOBIN ATTITUDE TOWARDS MATHEMATICS TEST will be used to pretest and posttest participants. The test was jointly designed and validated by the Division of Mathematics Education and the Division of Research and Evaluation.
- On-site monitoring by program coordinator.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted		✓												
4. Premeasures Administered			A	A										
5. Monitoring of Project				✓			✓			✓				
6. Mid-Measures Administered N/A				A										
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed											✓			
9. Post-Measures Administered										B/A	A			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev											✓	✓		
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENISVE READING PROJECT - AIDE SERVICES (R)
PART A K-3 AIDES

(**PBRS #** 611-02-518
611-01-506)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Leontine D. Scott
Frances Becker

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Arnold Escourt

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 3

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. Efficient use of the aides' time will be maintained by the teachers so that aides will spend (a) at least 60% of their time in supervising and/or working with individuals (one or two children) or small groups (from three to seven children), (b) not more than 20% of their time in clerical tasks (e.g., grading, record keeping), and (c) not more than 20% of their time in such tasks as class trips, operation of A/V equipment, housekeeping, and other activities. This will be verified by evaluators' inspection of Weekly Activity Logs to be maintained by aides, locally developed teacher questionnaires and observations made by members of the evaluation team using the Observational Checklist.

b. Aides will be assigned to work with not more than three teachers or classes each week as indicated by the Weekly Activity Logs and observations by the evaluation team using the Observational Checklist.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a/b This project will be evaluated by using ongoing observations, teachers' reports and logs kept by the aides. The evaluation team will use the Observational Checklist to record the classroom activities of the aides. A 20% sampling of schools participating in the project will be used.

a/b All aides will be randomly assigned to maintain during two weeks a Weekly Summary of Activities log. A special NCS form and VALTREP program have already been developed for data reduction purposes. Aides will meet early in September to receive training in how to properly record and score the logs.

1. The aides will report onto the log the grades they worked in during the two randomly assigned weeks.
2. Aides will report onto the log the number of regular teachers and classes they worked on a daily basis during the two assigned weeks. The total number for the two items will be tabulated and averaged across aides to determine the attainment of this objective.
3. Aides will be asked to record onto the log the number of hours and minutes they spent on a daily basis in 14 major activities. Such activities include tutoring individual children, small-group instruction, clerical tasks, class trips, housekeeping operation of A/V equipment and other kindergarten activities. The total number of minutes across aides and schools for each of the 14 areas will be tabulated, averaged and converted to an overall percentage of time.

EVALUATION MILESTONES		JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director		✓						✓			✓				
2. Evaluation Designed		✓													
3. Proposal Accepted		✓													
4. Premeasures Administered	N/A														
5. Monitoring of Project					A-B		A-B		A-B		A-B				
6. Mid-Measures Administered	N/A														
7. Interim Report								A-B							
8. Monitoring Completed												A-B			
9. Post-Measures Administered	N/A														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev													✓		
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed															

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT - AIDE SERVICES (R)
PART B - LIBRARY AIDES

(PBRS #611-02-503 **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Joan Myers

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Arnold Escourt

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 3

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

B. Library Aides

a. Each library assistant assigned to a regular, bilingual, or special education elementary school will assist the school's reading program by doing the following:

1. Ensure the availability of instructional and reading materials in the IMC for immediate use by teachers and children by arranging books on the shelves according to the Dewey Decimal System for non-fiction books and alphabetically by author's last name for fiction books. This will be verified by an evaluation team ascertaining whether at least 9 of 10 randomly selected books are shelved properly according to the ten broad categories of the Dewey Decimal System and whether 9 of 10 randomly selected fiction books are arranged in the proper letter category.

2. Filed catalog cards properly in the card catalog and shelf list. This will be verified by an evaluation team ascertaining whether 9 of 10 cards randomly selected from three drawers are properly filed in proper alphabetic or numeric sequence.

3. Set up and maintain a reading-level file for all books received as of September 1975. This will be verified by an evaluation team ascertaining whether 4 of 5 books randomly selected from a list of books that had been received as of September 1975 were properly filed in a reading-level file.

4. Motivate children to borrow books from the IMC by setting up at least three times per year, attractive book displays based on themes designated for all IMCs. The success of this motivation program will be measured by comparing the total circulation and requests of a sample of books on the particular theme during the 20 school days immediately before the display with the corresponding total circulation and requests figures during the first 20 school days of the display.

   A significant difference at the $p<.20$ level will be interpreted as evidence that displays have had a significant impact upon book circulation.

5. Operate the IMC A-V equipment for children at least once per month at the teacher's and/or children's request. This will be verified by logs to be maintained by the LAs.

b. In order to enhance the school's reading program, 2 in-service programs for elementary and 1 for Sr. High will be provided for Library assistants during the 1974-1975 school year to train the assistants to implement the above objectives as measured by a workshop questionnaire.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

c. The LA assigned to schools that have a minimum of 25% enrollment of children with Spanish surnames, will

1) assist Spanish-speaking children in the selection of materials in English and/or in Spanish. This will be verified by an evaluation team using a checklist to ascertain whether the bilingual LA assisted Spanish-speaking children in the selection of materials in English and/or in Spanish.

2) make Spanish library and reading materials available for parents and children. Such materials are intended to enhance and preserve the Spanish culture and thus provide a sense of pride and self-identification. This will be verified by an evaluation team ascertaining whether shelves containing reading materials in Spanish are available for children and parents.

d. Each library assistant assigned to a secondary school will assist the school's reading program by providing such library aide and secretarial services under the professional librarian's guidance and direction. A survey of the kind of services being performed shall be ascertained via questionnaires to be completed by the LA and librarian and the amount of time devoted to various services shall be obtained by having the LAs maintain two weeks during the year, a Weekly Summary of Activities log.

EVALUATION DESIGN

Objectives A1, A2, A3

For objectives A1-A3, the evaluation team will randomly visit a 20% sample of IMC elementary schools. A special monitoring checklist will be developed to record for each of the

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	X													
2. Evaluation Designed	X													
3. Proposal Accepted	X													
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project				A-D	A-D	A-D	A-D	A-D	A-D	A-D	A-D			
6. Mid-Measures Administered						X			X					
7. Interim Report							X							
8. Monitoring Completed											X			
9. Post-Measures Administered											A-D			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev													X	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														X
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														X

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

The Weekly Summary of Activities NCS sheets will have to be run through by December 1, 1975 and through Dr. Pierson's program by December 15, 1975 for the interim report and by May 15, 1975 (for both) for the final report.

objectives how many of the randomly selected books and/or cards were properly filed. An average mean and variance across schools will be summarized in reporting the attainment (or degree of success) of the objectives.

Objective A4. An overall average across schools will determine whether book displays have a significant impact upon circulation. The Fishers "t" test will be used in the statistical test as a prepost analysis. A $p < .20$ level will be accepted as the point of significance.

Objective A5. The logs will be summarized across schools to determine whether the LAs were operating AV equipment for children at least once per month.

B. The evaluation team will visit the three in-service programs and will determine whether the sessions were used to train the LAs to implement the objectives of the project. A workshop questionnaire will be distributed to the LAs to determine whether the participants felt that the in-service workshops were worthwhile and met the objective.

C1. For objectives C1 and C2, the evaluation team will randomly visit a 30% sampling of IMC bilingual elementary schools to ascertain whether bilingual LAs assist Spanish-speaking childran in the selection of materials in English and/or in Spanish, and whether shelves containing reading materials in Spanish are available for children and parents. Only upon finding 80% of sampled schools performing such activities will these two objectives be considered as having been attained.

D. The evaluation team, during their visits, will cross check the data and will record onto an Observational Checklist, the clerical and mechanical tasks that were being performed by the LAs. Data will be summarized and tabulated in terms of frequency of occurrence. The team will randomly visit a 20% sampling of IMC secondary schools.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES (continued)

The multipurpose form questionnaires must also be run by December 1, 1975 and assistance for the ITEMS R program by December 15, 1975 and by May 15, 1975 for the final report.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE READING PROGRAM AIDE SERVICES (R) PART C - PARENT AIDES NONPUBLIC **(PBRS #** 611-06-613**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Charles McLaughlin

PROJECT EVALUATOR: William Loue III
Arnold Escourt

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 3

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

C. Parent Aides - Non-public school

During the 1975-1976 school year, the presence of parent school aides in classrooms of target schools will facilitate small group and individualized instruction in basic academic skill areas (reading, language arts, mathematics) as determined by systematic observations of parent aide classrooms using the Learning Environment Checklist. The following criteria will be expected:

1. With respect to classroom grouping arrangements, pupils will be observed working in small groups (2-10 pupils) and/or as individuals during at least 60% of observed time.

2. With respect to the level of instructional differentiation, in less than 10% of observed time will all pupils be observed completing the same assignment.

3. With respect to the role of the teacher, in at least 30% of observed time teachers will be observed actively guiding and/or assisting groups or individuals.

4. With respect to the activities of the aides, at least 20% of observed time will be devoted to supervising and/or assisting individual children.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

Systematic observations of classrooms with parent aide service will be conducted during the 1975-1976 school year in 12 randomly selected project schools using the Learning Environment Checklist. A description of the content and utilization of the checklist may be found in the 1973-1974 evaluation report for the Individualized Education Center Project.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	√													
2. Evaluation Designed	√													
3. Proposal Accepted	√													
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project				√	√	√	√	√	√	√				
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report							√							
8. Monitoring Completed										√				
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												√		
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													√	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														√

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Comprehensive Reading Program District 1 (R)		**(PBRS #** 611-01-02-03-04-05-796 **)**
PROJECT DIRECTOR: Verneta Harvey	**PROJECT EVALUATOR:** Sherrie Rose	**INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:** 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

Kindergarten Objectives

To develop the readiness skills of kindergarten pupils who are entering school September, 1975, to the extent that the district frequency distribution will approximate the national norming distribution on the S.E.S.A.T.

Primary Objectives

1. To improve the total reading achievement of the pupils in grades 1 and 2, to the extent that the distribution of scores for these grades will be equal to or greater than the distribution of scores for the previous year in those grades as measured by the C.A.T.

2. To improve the total reading scores, during the course of the 1975-76 school year, of those primary pupils in year 3, to the extent that there will be a 20% reduction in the number of pupils scoring below the 50th percentile as measured by the C.A.T.

Intermediate Objectives

1a. To reduce the percentage of 4th grade pupils scoring below the 16th percentile in total reading to 19% during the 1975-76 school year as measured by the C.A.T.
b. To reduce the percentage of pupils scoring between the 16th and 49th percentile in total reading to 39% during the 1975-76 school year as measured by the C.A.T.

2a. To reduce the percentage of 5th grade pupils scoring below the 16th percentile in total reading to 25% during the 1975-76 school year as measured by the C.A.T.
b. To reduce the percentage of pupils scoring between the 16th and 49th percentile in total reading to 38% during the 1975-76 school year as measured by the C.A.T.

3a. To reduce the percentage of 6th grade pupils scoring below the 16th percentile in total reading to 21% during the 1975-76 school year as measured by the C.A.T.
b. To reduce the percentage of pupils scoring between the 16th and 49th percentile in total reading to 42% during the 1975-76 school year as measured by the C.A.T.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

To determine the extent to which reading objectives are achieved; a posttest evaluation design is utilized, using the California Achievement Test total reading percentiles. The C.A.T. is the measuring instrument of all instructional levels except the kindergarten. For the kindergarten, the S.E.S.A.T. is used.

Success is determined by examining the differences in the proportions of students scoring in designated percentile bands.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed		✓												
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report								✓						
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

Secondary Objectives

1a. To reduce to 27% the number of students in the 7th grade scoring below the 16th percentile as measured by the California Achievement Test, total reading score.
b. To reduce to 39% the number of students in the 7th gtade scoring between the 16th to 49th percentile as measured by the C.A.T., total reading score.

2a. To reduce to 29% the number of students in the 8th grade scoring below the 16th percentile as measured by the California Achievement Test, total reading score.
b. To reduce the 41% the number of students in the 8th grade scoring between the 16th to 49th percentile as measured by the C.A.T., total reading score.

3a. To reduce to 36% the number of students in the 9th grade scoring below the 16th percentile as measured by the California Achievemen Test, total reading score.
b. To reduce the 36% the number of students in the 9th grade scoring between the 16th to 49th percentile as measured by the C.A.T., total reading score.
4a. To reduce to 47% the number of students in the 10th grade scoring below the 16th percentile as measured by the California Achievement Test, total reading score.
b. To reduce to 35% the number of students in the 10th grade scoring between the 16th to 49th percentile as measured by the C.A.T., total reading score.

5. To reduce to 53% the number of students in the 11th grade scoring below the 16th percentile as measured by the California Achievemen Test, total reading score.

6. To reduce to 49% the number of students in the 12th grade scoring below the 16th percentile as measured by the California Achievement Test, total reading score.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Comprehensive Reading Program
District Two (R)
(PBRS #)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Mr. Michael Iannelli
PROJECT EVALUATOR: Mr. James E. Scheib
INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. Improvement of reading comprehension skills in grades 2 to 12 so that compared to February 1975 results two percent more students will score above the national 16th percentile at each grade level.

b. Improvement of reading vocabulary in grades 1 to 12 so that compared to February 1975 results two percent more students will score above the national 16th percentile at each grade level.

c. Improvement in mastery of phonics elements in the primary grades, so that compared to the May 1975 results, a greater percentage of third grade students will demonstrate mastery of phonics skills as measured by the Sight and Sound Inventory.

d. The distribution of scores of kindergarten pupils on the Letters and Sounds and Aural Comprehension Subtests of the S.E.S.A.T. I will approximate the distribution of the norming population.

e. Improvement in Phonics Skills among all students in programmed reading and multilevel I in grades 7 to 10, so that compared to the September 1975 results a greater percentage of these students will demonstrate mastery of these skills as measured by the Sight and Sound Inventory, Form B.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a. California Achievement Test, Reading Comprehension Subtest: Frequency distribution will be computed and compared with February 1975 results.

b. California Achievement, Vocabulary Subtest: Frequency distribution will be computed and compared with February 1975 results.

c. Sight and Sound Inventory: Administered in May, 1976 Raw score frequency distributions with mastery set at 28 of 31 items for Form A and 49 of 54 items for Form B. Proportion of pupils achieving mastery will be computed.

d. Stanford Early School Achievement Test, Aural Comprehension Subtest and Letters and Sounds subtest will be administered in February. The distributions of scores will be computed and compared to the norming population.

e. Sight and Sound Inventory, Form B: Administered in September and May. Raw score frequency distributions with mastery set at 49 of 54 items. Proportion of pupils achieving mastery on pre- and post-tests will be computed and compared.

			1975								1976			
EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report								✓						
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev													✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														✓
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

Scoring of Sight and Sound; Programming and valtrep for revised Sight and Sound and new Level C.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Comprehensive Reading Program
District Three (R)

(PBRS #)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Mr. Arther Romanelli

PROJECT EVALUATOR: James E. Scheib

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. Improvement of reading skills in grades 1 to 12 so that compared to February 1975 results two percent more students will score above the national 16th percentile at each grade level.

B. All third year students are to master at least 200 of the 220 words of the Dolch Basic Sight Word Vocabulary by the final check point of the 1975-1976 school year.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A. California Achievement Test, Reading subtests: frequency distribution will be be computed and compared with February 1975 results.

B. All third year students will be individually tested with an oral reading of a sample of the Dolch List. The list is divided into four comparable subsets and the subtests are alternated so that all words on the list are administered to one fourth of the district's third graders.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed		✓												
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report								✓						
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev													✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														✓
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Comprehensive Reading Program
District Four (R)

(PBRS #)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Katherine Jackson

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Sherry Rose

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. To decrease by 20% the proportion of pupils in grades 3, 4, and 6 who score below the 16th percentile on the C. A. T.

b. To decrease by 30% the proportion of pupils in grade 5 who score below the 16th percentile on the C. A. T.

c. To decrease by 16% the proportion of pupils in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 who score between the 16th and 49th percentiles on the C. A. T.

d. To continue to decrease the average percentage of students scoring below the 16th percentile in C. A. T. in grades 7 through 9 by 8% as measured by the C. A. T.

e. To decrease the average percent of students scoring between the 16th to 49th percentile in grades 7 through 9 as measured by the C. A. T.

f. To decrease the average percent of students scoring between the 16th to 49th percentile in C. A. T. in grade 10 by 5% as measured by the C. A. T.

g. To decrease the average percentage of students scoring below the 16th percentile in C. A. T. in grade 11 by 5% as measured by the C. A. T.

h. To decrease the average percent of students scoring between the 16th to 49th percentile in grade 11 by 5% as measured by the C. A. T.

j. To decrease the average percent of students scoring between the 16th to 49th percentile in grade 12 by 5% as measured by the C. A. T.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

B. Evaluation Design

To determine the extent to which reading objectives are achieved; a posttest evaluation design is utilized, using the California Achievement Test total reading percentiles. The C.A.T. is the measuring instrument of all instructional levels except the kindergarten. For the kindergarten, the S.E.S.A.T. is used.

Success is determined by examining the differences in the proportions of students scoring in designated percentile bands.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	√													
2. Evaluation Designed		√												
3. Proposal Accepted			√											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project								√						
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

C. Test scoring services that include the C.A.T. scores/results in percentile and scale scores.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT
DISTRICT 5 (R)

(PBRS #)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Irving Rosen

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Alan Solomon

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. No more than 15% of all kindergarten children will score below the 16th percentile on the Letters and Sounds Subtest of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test.

B. No more than 15% of all kindergarten children will score below the 16th percentile on the Aural Comprehension Subtest of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test.

C. There will be a reduction of 5% or more in the number of kindergarten students scoring below the 50th percentile in the Letters and Sounds Subtest of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test.

D. No more than 13% of all year 1 pupils will score below the 16th percentile in Total Reading on the California Achievement Test.

E. There will be a reduction of 5% or more in the number of students (grades 1-12) scoring below the 50th percentile in the Total Reading score of the California Achievement Test.

F. No more than 18% of all grade 2 pupils will score below the 16th percentile in Total Reading on the California Achievement Test.

G. No more than 27% of all grade 3 pupils will score below the 16th percentile in Total Reading on the California Achievement Test.

H. No more than 29% of all grade 4 pupils will score below the 16th percentile in Total Reading on the California Achievement Test.

I. No more than 41% of all grade 5 pupils wqll score below the 16th percentile in Total Readi-g on the California Achievement Test.

J. No more than 38% of all grade 6 pupils will score below the 16th percentile in Total Reading on the C.A.T.

K. No more than 45% of all grade 7 pupils will score below the 16th percentile in Total Reading on the California Achievement Test.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

Objectives A, B, C, and Q - StanfordEarly School Achievement Test data from the relevant subtests (Aural Comprehension and Letters and Sounds) will be summarized.
The percentage of students below the 16th and 50th percentiles will be computed and compared to the previous years' results.

Objectives D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O and P -

California Achievement Test
The percentage of students scoring below the 16th and 50th percentile will be computed by grade and compared to the previous years' results.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed		✓												
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project								✓						
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED (cont.)

L. No more than 41% of all grade 8 pupils will score below the 16th percentile in Total Reading on the California Achievement Test.

M. No more than 44% of all grade 9 students will score below the 16th percentile in Total Reading on the C.A.T.

N. No more than 45% of all grade 10 students will score below the 16th percentile in Total Reading on the C.A.T.

O. No more than 51% of all grade 11 students will score below the 16th percentile in Total Reading on the C.A.T.

P. No more than 47% of all grade 12 students will score below the 16th percentile in Total Reading on the C.A.T.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT:	Comprehensive Reading Program District 6 (R)			**(PBRS #**	**)**
PROJECT DIRECTOR:	Norman Klein	**PROJECT EVALUATOR:**	Joseph Gavin	**INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:**	1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. In each grade from 1 to 8, to increase by five, the percentage of pupils achieving above the 50th percentile in the February, 1976 total reading score of the California Achievement Test when compared to the achievement of the same grade in February, 1975

B. To increase by five, the percentage of kindergarten pupils achieving above the 50th percentile in the February, 1976 Letters and Sounds, Environment and Aural Comprehension Subtests of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test when compared to the February, 1975 achievement of kindergarten pupils.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A. Administer and score C.A.T. tests in February, 1976
.Compute number of pupils above nat't norm in Total Reading
.Compare results with February, 1975 C.A.T.

B. Administer and score SESAT tests in February, 1975
.Compute number of pupils above the nat'l norm in Environment, Letters & Sounds, and Auditory Comprehension
.Compare results with February, 1975 SESAT

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director			√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		
2. Evaluation Designed	√													
3. Proposal Accepted		√												
4. Premeasures Administered	√													
5. Monitoring of Project				√	√			√		√				
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report	√													
8. Monitoring Completed												√		
9. Post-Measures Administered								√						
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev													√	√
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														√
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														√

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Comprehensive Reading Program
District 7 (R)

(PBRS #)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Reeda Kravinsky

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Alan Solomon

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. There will be a reduction of 5% in the number of Title I kindergarten students scoring below the 50th percentile on the Letters and Sounds and Aural Comprehension Subtests of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test.

B. There will be a reduction of 5% in the number of Title I students (grades 1 through 8) scoring below the 50th percentile on the Total Reading score on the California Achievement Test.

C. Ninety percent of kindergarten pupils will attain upper case alphabet mastery and 85% will show lower case alphabet mastery by June 1976.

D. Ninety-five percent of grade 1 pupils will attain upper case alphabet mastery and 90% will show lower case mastery by June, 1976.

E. Ninety-eight percent of grade 2 pupils will show upper case alphabet mastery and 95% will show lower case mastery by June, 1976.

F. Twenty percent of the kindergarten pupils will master Form A of the phonics inventory by June, 1976.

G. Seventy percent of grade 1 pupils will master Form A of the phonics inventory by June, 1976.

H. Eighty percent of grade 2 pupils will master Form A of the phonics inventory by June, 1976.

I. Ninety percent of the grade 3 pupils will master Form A of the phonics inventory and 40% will master Form B.

J. Sixty percent of the grade 4 pupils will master Form B of the phonics inventory.

K. Seventy-five percent of grade 5 pupils will master Form B of the phonics inventory.

L. Ninety percent of grade 6 pupils will master Form B of the phonics inventory.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

Objective A - Stanford Early School Achievement Test
Data from the relevant subtest (Aural Comprehension or Letters and Sounds) will be summarized. The percentage of students below the 16th and 50th percentiles will be computed and compared to the previous years' results.

Objective B - California Achievement Test

The percentage of Title I students scoring below the 50th percentile in Total Reading will be calculated by grade and compared to the previous years' results.

Objective C,-D, E,

The Alphabet Mastery Test will be administered in June, 1976. Data will be summarized by grade and the results compared to those specified in the objective.

Objectives F, G, H, I, J, K, and L

The phonics Inventory will be administered in June, 1976. Data will be summerized by grade and the results compared to those specified in the objective.

			1975							1976				
EVALUATION MILESTONES	**JULY**	**AUG.**	**SEPT.**	**OCT**	**NOV.**	**DEC.**	**JAN.**	**FEB.**	**MAR.**	**APR.**	**MAY**	**JUNE**	**JULY**	**AUG**
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed		✓												
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project								✓						
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

***=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.**

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

It is anticipated that 50,000 Sight and Sound Inventories will be scanned and reports produced; half at the beginning of the year, and half at the end.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE READING PROGRAM -READING SKILLS CENTERS AND SHARED TIME READING COMPONENTS (R) PARTS A & B **(PBRS #** 611-02-666**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: IDA KRAVITZ

PROJECT EVALUATOR: ARNOLD ESCOURT

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 2

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. Pupils participating in this project three or more times a week during the school year will improve their vocabulary/comprehension skills as indicated by Fall and Spring administration of Informal Reading Inventories (IRI). A minimum of 75% of the group will gain one book level and 55% will gain two book levels.

b. Pupils participating in this project three or more times a week during the school year will improve their decoding skills as indicated by a 20% gain in the mean score of the 64-item Botel Phonics Inventory administered in September and May.

c. During the school year Reading Skill Center teachers will provide consultation services to school staff and will continue to disseminate information, methods and techniques to both local and out-of-city educators as indicated by Skill Center teacher records.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

The project will be evaluated utilizing a pre post design supported by periodic visits to sites and monitoring of instructional practices using the Observation Checklist.

The sample will include the population of pupils attending the program three or more times each week during the school year.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	X						X				X			
2. Evaluation Designed		X												
3. Proposal Accepted		X												
4. Premeasures Administered			1,2											
5. Monitoring of Project				X		X		X		X				
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report							X							
8. Monitoring Completed												X		
9. Post-Measures Administered											1,2			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												X		
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													X	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed													X	

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, MAasuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

Conversion of LISA form to NCS format

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE READING PROGRAM
IMPROVEMENT OF READING SKILLS (R)
PART C

(PBRS # 611-06-718**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Charles McLaughlin

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Marion Kaplan

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 3

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. Project pupils will increase their reading-achievement levels to the extent that 90% of the pupils gain at least one book level and 60% gain two or more book levels between September pretest and May posttest on a group Informal Reading Inventory.

b. Project pupils will improve their decoding skills to the extent that there is an increase of 20 points in the percentage of pupils attaining an 80% mastery score (68 or more correct out of 85 items) on a project-specific phonics inventory between September pretest and May posttest.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a. A group Informal Reading Inventory will be administered to all project pupils in September and May. The number and percentage of children gaining 0, 1, and 2 or more book levels will be calculated. The results will be compared with the stated criteria.

b. In order to provide assessment of specific decoding skills, and 85 item project specific phonics inventory will be administered to all project pupils in September and May. For each administration, the number and percentage of students attaining mastery (80%) will be calculated. The percentage of pupils who attain mastery will be compared for pretest and posttest. This difference will be compared against the stated criterion.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed			✓											
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered			A/B											
5. Monitoring of Project				✓		✓		✓		✓				
6. Mid-Measures Administered	N/A													
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed										✓				
9. Post-Measures Administered											A/B			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓	✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed													✓	

***=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, MAasuring Device, Sample, etc.**

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE READING PROGRAM
Individualized Education Center (R) (**PBRS #** 611-06-733)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Charles McLaughlin

PROJECT EVALUATOR: William E. Loue III

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 2

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. Project pupils will develop basic skills in reading during the 1975-1976 school year to the extent evidenced by at least maintaining their national percentile ranks from the previous school year on the vocabulary and comprehension sections of the California Achievement Tests.

b. Project pupils will develop basic skills in mathematics during the 1975-1976 school year to the extent evidenced by at least maintaining their national percentile ranks from the previous school year on the Computation and Concepts Problems sections of the California Achievement Tests.

c. With the assistance of paraprofessionals and a reading specialist teacher, project teachers will implement a system of individualized instruction in basic academic skill areas (reading, language arts and mathematics) as determined by systematic observations of IEC classrooms using the Learning Environment Checklist. The following criteria will be applied.

1. with respect to classroom grouping arrangements, pupils will be observed working in small groups (2 to 10 pupils) and/or as individuals during at least 85% of observed time
2. with respect to the level of instructional differentiating in less than 5% of observed time will all pupils be observed completing the same assignment
3. with respect to the role of the teacher, in at least 50% of observed time, teachers will be observed actively guiding and/or assisting groups or individuals
4. with respect to the activities of the paraprofessionals, at least 25% of observed time will be devoted to working with individual children
5. with respect to the pupils' activities, at least 25% of observed time will be devoted to individual activities (self-selected or teacher-directed)

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a./b. The California Achievement Tests will be administered to all pupils in grades 1 to 8 in April. The results will be compared with 1975 results using subtests mean scores for each grade level.

c. Scheduled formal observations of all classes in the project will be conducted in October, January and May. An observational checklist, The Learning Environment Checklist, will be used to describe the instructional system employed in each classroom in the I.E.C. A description of the content and utilization of this checklist may be found in the 1973-1974 evaluation report for the Individualized Education Center.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project				✓			✓				✓			
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed											✓			
9. Post-Measures Administered										a,b				
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓		
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Comprehensive Reading Program
Operation Individual (R)

(PBRS # 611-06-615)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Charles McLaughlin

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Marion Kaplan

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 3

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. During the school year, students will improve their reading skills to the extent that 66% of the participating students who receive intensive service will demonstrate a month-for-month gain in G.E. Total Reading score on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills between the pre-and posttests.

b. During the school year, students will improve their ability to use reference materials to the extent that 66% of the participating students who receive intensive service will demonstrate a month-for-month gain in G.E. Reference Skills score on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills between the pre-and posttests.

c. During the school year, students will improve their reading skills to the extent that 66% of the participating students who receive supportive reading service will demonstrate a month-for-month gain in G.E. Total Reading score on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills between pre-and posttests.

d. During the school year, students will improve their ability to use reference materials to the extent that 66% of the participating students who receive supportive reading service will demonstrate a month-for-month gain in G.E. Reference Skills score on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills between the pre-and posttests.

e. During the school year, students will improve their performance in various subjects to the extent that 66% of the participating students who receive intensive service will obtain a minimum of one quarterly rating of at least "some additional knowledge gained" on the Student Skill Record Rating Form in four of five subject areas: English, Reading, Science, Social Studies, and Mathematics.

f. During the school year, students will improve their performance in various subjects to the extent that 66% of the participating students who receive intensive service will obtain a minimum of one quarterly rating of at least "good responsibility for own learning" on the Student Skill Record Rating Form in four of five subject areas: English, Reading, Science, Social Studies, and Mathematics.

(continued)

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED (continued)

g. During the school year, students will improve their performance in reading to the extent that 66% of the participating students who receive supportive reading service will obtain a minimum of one quarterly rating of at least "some additional knowledge gained" on the Student Skill Record Rating Form for Reading.

h. During the school year, students will improve their performance in reading to the extent that 66% of the participating students who receive supportive reading service will obtain a minimum of one quarterly rating of at least "good responsibility for own learning" on the Student Skill Record Rating Form for Reading.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a. The Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension tests (Total Reading) of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills will be administered to participating students in October and in April. The number and percentage of students who gain less than 0.6 G.E., 0.6-1.0 G.E., 1.1-1.5 G.E., 1.6-2.0 G.E., and 2.1 or more G.E. will be calculated. The results will be compared to the expected percentage (66%).

b. The Reference Skills test of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills will be administered to participating students in October and in April. The number and percentage of students who gain less than 0.6 G.E., 0.6-1.0 G.E., 1.1-1.5 G.E., 1.6-2.0 G.E., and 2.1 or more G.E. will be calculated. The results will be compared to the expected percentage (66%).

c. The Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension tests (Total Reading) of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills will be administered to participating students in October and in April. The number and percentage of students who gain less than 0.6 G.E., 0.6-1.0 G.E., 1.1-1.5 G.E., 1.6-2.0 G.E., and 2.1 or more G.E. will be calculated. The results will be compared to the expected percentage (66%).

d. The Reference Skills test of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills will be administered to participating students in October and in April. The number and percentage of students who gain less than 0.6 G.E., 0.6-1.0 G.E., 1.1-1.5 G.E., 1.6-2.0 G.E., and 2.1 or more G.E. will be calculated. The results will be compared to the expected percentage (66%).

e. Four times during the school year, each subject teacher (Science, Mathematics, Social Studies, Reading, and English) will rate each pupil's competancy on subject specific Skill Records. For each quarter, a list will be made of the names of students meeting the criterion of at least "some additional knowledge gained" in four of five subject areas. The number and percentage of students meeting the criteria for one, two, three, and four of the marking periods will be computed and compared to the stated criterion.

f. Four times during the school year, each subject teacher (Science, Mathematics, Social Studies, Reading, and English) will rate each pupil's competancy on subject specific Skill Records. For each quarter, a list will be made of the names of students meeting the criterion of at least "good responsibility for own learning" in four of five subject areas. The number and percentage of students meeting the criteria for one, two, three, and four of the marking periods will be computed and compared to the stated criterion.

g. Four times during the year, the reading teacher will rate each pupil's competancy on a subject specific Skill Record. For each quarter, a list will be made of the names of students meeting the criterion of at least "some additional knowledge gained". The number and percentage of students meeting the rating criteria for one, two, three, and four of the marking periods will be computed and compared to the stated criterion.

(continued)

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN) (continued)

h. Four times during the year, the reading teacher will rate each pupil's competancy on a subject specific Skill Record. For each quarter, a list will be made of the names of students meeting the criterion of at least "good responsibility for own learning". The number and percentage of students meeting the rating criteria for one, two, three, and four of the marking periods will be computed and compared to the stated criterion.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered				a,b, c,d	e,f, g,h									
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered							e,f, g,h		e,f g,h					
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed											✓			
9. Post-Measures Administered										a,b, c,d,	e,f g,h			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓		
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, MAasuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

Revision of Skill Records

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

(PBRS #611-06-719)

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE READING PROGRAM
PRIMARY READING SKILLS CENTERS (R)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Charles McLaughlin

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Marion Kaplan

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 3

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. Participating pupils in Grades 2-4 will improve their word-attack skills to the extent that there is an increase of 20 points in the percentage of pupils attaining an 80% mastery score on the Botel Phonics Inventory between September pretest and May posttest.

b. Participating pupils in grades 2-4 will increase their reading-achievement levels to the extent that 90% of the pupils gain at least one book level and 60% gain at least two book levels between September pretest and May posttest on a group Informal Reading Inventory.

c. Participating first-grade pupils will develop their alphabet-recognition skills to the extent that 95% will achieve a score of 50 correct on a 52-item Alphabet-Recognition Test administered in May.

d. Participating pupils in grades 2-4 will increase their vocabulary knowledge to the extent that there is, in one year, a one-year gain in average GE score on the CAT-70 Vocabulary subtest administered each January.

e. Participating pupils in grades 2-4 will increase their reading comprehension skills to the extent that there is, in one year, a one-year gain in average GE score on the CAT-70 Reading Comprehension subtest administered each January.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a. The Alphabet Recognition Test will be administered to all project pupils in grade 1. The number and percentage of pupils achieving mastery (50 or more correct) will be calculated. Comparison will be made between the number of pupils attaining mastery and the stated criteria.

b. The group Informal Reading Inventory will be administered to all pupils in grades 2-4 in September and May. The number and percentage of children gaining 0, 1 and 2 or book levels will be calculated. The results will be compared with the stated criteria.

c. In order to provide assessment of word attack skills, the Botel Phonics Inventory will be administered to all pupils in grades 2-4 in September and May. For each administration, the number and percentage will be calculated. The percentage of pupils who attain mastery will be compared for pretest and posttest. The difference will be compared against the stated criterion.

d. The CAT-70 Vocabulary Subtest will be administered in January to all project pupils in grades 2-4. Mean GE scores for each grade will be calculated and will be compared with the average GE scores from January of the previous January.

e. The CAT-70 Reading Comprehension Subtest will be administered in January to all project pupils in grades 2-4. Mean GE scores for each grade will be calculated and will be compared with the average GE scores from January of the previous year.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY
1. Conference with Project Director	✓												
2. Evaluation Designed			✓										
3. Proposal Accepted			✓										
4. Premeasures Administered			BC										
5. Monitoring of Project				✓			✓			✓			
6. Mid-Measures Administered							DE						
7. Interim Report							✓						
8. Monitoring Completed										✓			
9. Post-Measures Administered											ABC		
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓	✓
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed													✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE READING PROGRAM: READING IMPROVEMENT THROUGH TEACHER EDUCATION (R) **(PBRS #** 511-06-537 **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Charles McLaughlin **PROJECT EVALUATOR:** Marion Kaplan **INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:** 2

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. Teachers receiving RITE services will perceive themselves as increasing their knowledge related to the reading instructional competencies included on the RITE Teacher Rating Scale. This will be indicated by a significantly ($p<.05$) higher average score on the Rating Scale in May than in September.

B. Beginning teachers who receive RITE services during the school year will demonstrate increasing knowledge of the procedures of the DRA and increasing ability to interpret available test data as a basis for diagnostic-prescriptive teaching. This will be indicated by a statistically significant ($p<.05$) increase from October until April in the mean score on each section of the RITE Case Study Instrument.

C. During the current school year, the RITE staff will provide at least 1,800 individual service contacts to teachers in the areas of reading approaches, diagnosis and prescription, provision of varied independent activities, and reading lesson organization and management. A service contact is defined as a scheduled conference, an observation, or a demonstration. Project staff will complete Contact Frequency Reports every 2 months.

D. Kindergarten teachers receiving RITE services will be able to diagnose and prescribe for individual pupil reading-readiness needs to the extent that by the end of April, 75% of the teachers will have 1) administered the placement test of the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks (IDT), 2) maintained the IDT profile sheets, 3) prescribed corrective activities for deficiency areas, and 4) utilized other available testing and observational data. This will be determined by evaluators' examination of classroom records and by teacher interviews (on a locally developed interview schedule).

E. Kindergarten teachers receiving RITE services will improve their skills in providing useful and varied activities designed to extend children's listening skills and language development. It is expected that, for 75% of the teachers, evaluators will observe improvement indicated by a higher score in April than in October on each of the following parts of the RITE Kindergarten Observational Rating Scale: 1) Story-Telling Techniques, 2) Classroom Activity Centers, 3) Language Experience Charts, 4) Classroom Visual Displays.

F. Kindergarten teachers receiving RITE services will improve their skills in organizing and managing their classroom reading-readiness programs. It is expected that, for 75% of the teachers, evaluators will observe improvement indicated by a higher score in April than in October on each of the following parts of the RITE Kindergarten Observational Rating Scale: 1) Arrangement of Classroom Equipment and Use of Space, 2) Use of Organizational Mechanics which Facilitate Multilevel Language/Listening Activities, 3) Use of Paraprofessional Help.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A. The RITE Teacher Rating Scale will be administered in September and again in May, to a sample of teachers who are receiving RITE services. The mean pretest score and the mean posttest score will be compared using a correlated "t" test (p<.05).

B. All beginning teachers receiving RITE services will respond to both sections of the RITE Case Study in October and in April. Each paper will be scored by a team of 3 RITE staff members, using pre-established scoring standards. Each teacher's score will be the average of the three ratings. For each section of the Case Study, the mean pretest score and the mean posttest score will be compared using a correlated "t" test. (p<.05).

C. The completed Contact Frequency Reports will be forwarded to the evaluators by the RITE staff. The number of observations, demonstrations, conferences and group meetings for each of the 4 topics will be calculated. The results will be reported in descriptive terms and compared with the stated criterion.

D. As part of the April observation of the Kindergarten teachers receiving RITE services, evaluators will examine the various pupil records maintained by each teacher (including the IDT) and will interview the teacher concerning the use of these records in planning instruction. Evaluators will judge the adequacy of the records and the responses as related to the criteria stated in the objective. The number and percentage of teachers meeting the criteria will be calculated and compared with the stated expectation.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered			A	BE F										
5. Monitoring of Project				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
6. Mid-Measures Administered				C		C		C		C				
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed											✓			
9. Post-Measures Administered										BE DF	A			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓	✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed													✓	

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

1. Development of Kindergarten Observational Rating Scale
2. Revision of RITE Teacher Rating Scale
3. Revision of program for scoring attitude instruments

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (continued)

E. All kindergarten teachers receiving RITE services will be observed by evaluators in October and again in April. Using the RITE Kindergarten Observational Rating Scale (to be developed jointly by evaluators and project staff), evaluators will rate teachers on those areas of instruction relevant to the objective. The percentage of teachers whose scores, on all relevant sections, are higher in April than in October will be calculated and compared with the stated criterion.

F. Procedures will be similar to those described under E.

67

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPUTER-MANAGED INSTRUCTION (R) (**PBRS** #611-04-560)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: SYLVIA CHARP

PROJECT EVALUATOR: THOMAS CLARK

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. Participating primary-grade pupils will improve in decoding and comprehension, study skills, and appreciation for literature so that:

1. Eighty percent of the pupils will evidence 90% mastery on the respective Read-On Criterion-Referenced Tests.

2. Project pupils will score higher ($p<.20$) than comparable non-participating pupils on the Sight and Sound phonics inventory, Informal Reading Inventory, and the California Achievement Test - Reading.

B. Participating primary-grade pupils will improve in the fundamentals of arithmetic so that 80% of the students will evidence 90% mastery of the respective Philadelphia Mathematics Competencies Tests.

C. Participating intermediate and secondary grade pupils will improve in reading skills so that 80% of the students will evidence 90% on the respective Reading Competency tests.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A.(1) Computer reports of the participating pupils mastery rates on the criterion-referenced tests will be summarized.

(2) Same-school non-participating pupils will be selected as a comparison group on the basis of the CAT-70 1974-1975 scores. Differences between participating pupils and the comparison groups on the phonics inventory, the IRI and the Reading will be tested to the .20 Level with t tests.

B.C. Summaries will be made of computer reports for pupil mastery on both the Mathematics Competencies Tests and the Reading Competencies Tests.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered			✓	✓										
5. Monitoring of Project			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
6. Mid-Measures Administered	NA													
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed											✓			
9. Post-Measures Administered										✓	✓			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓		
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

NONE

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Counseling Services (R) (**PBRS #**611-06-614)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Albert Bell

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Marion Kaplan

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. During the school year, the project staff will provide psychodiagnostic testing and evaluation for at least 450 pupils referred for academic, emotional, or social problems. Project staff will complete an individual Case Record Form for each pupil referred for this service.

B. During the school year, the project staff will provide remedial counseling help to at least 375 pupils identified as having academic, emotional, or social difficulties. Project staff will complete an individual Case Record Form for each pupil receiving this service.

C. During the school year, the project staff will provide an individualized learning therapy program for at least 50 pupils identified as having severe reading disabilities. It is expected that 50% of these pupils will gain at least one book level from pretest until posttest on an Informal Reading Inventory. The project staff will complete an Individualized Learning Therapy Case Record Form for each student receiving this service.

D. During the school year, the project staff will provide preventive psychological services (such as group discussions to foster academic motivation, self awareness, and social interaction) to at least 2,000 pupils. Project staff will maintain activity logs of preventive psychological services listing the nature of each activity and the number of pupils involved.

E. During the school year, the project staff will provide services such as classroom-management consultations and child-development consultations to at least 100 teachers. Project staff will maintain activity logs of services to teachers listing the nature of each activity and the number of teachers involved.

F. During the school year, the project staff will provide services to at least 400 parents which will include activities designed to increase the parents' knowledge of involvement with, and skill in dealing with their children's academic and psychosocial development. Project staff will maintain activity logs of services to parents listing the nature of the activity and the number of parents involved.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A. Data from the Individual Case Records will be compiled to indicate the number of pupils receiving psychodiagnosis of academic, emotional, and social problems. In order to assess the effectiveness of this service, interviews of principals and a sample of teachers will be conducted during the course of the school year. At the end of the year, teachers and principals will complete a questionnaire. Data from the interviews and questionnaires will be compiled and reported in descriptive terms.

B. In addition to the procedures described under A, a sample of pupils receiving these services will be interviewed and a sample of parents, whose children received these services, will complete questionnaires. The data from these interviews and questionnaires also will be compiled and the results reported in descriptive terms.

C. Procedures will be similar to those described under B utilizing the Individualized Learning Therapy Case Record Form. In addition, the project staff will administer an Informal Reading Inventory to each pupil at the beginning and end of the therapy. The number and percentage of pupils gaining one book level will be calculated and compared with the stated criterion.

D. Logs indicating the date, number of pupils involved, and a description of each activity will be maintained by the project staff in each participating school. Data from these logs will be compiled to determine the number pupils receiving preventive psychological services.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed			✓											
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project				✓										
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed										✓				
9. Post-Measures Administered											ABC DEF			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓	✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed													✓	

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

Revision of interview schedules

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (continued)

E. Logs indicating the date, number of teachers involved, and a description of each activity will be maintained by the project staff in each participating school. Data from these logs will be compiled to determine the number of teachers receiving these services.

F. Logs describing each activity and indicating the date and number of parents involved will be maintained by the project staff in each participating school. Data from these logs will be compiled to determine the number parents receiving these services.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Creative Dramatics (R) **(PBRS #**611-02-548 **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Harriet Ehrlich **PROJECT EVALUATOR:** Judith Green Leibovitz **INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:** 4

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. In sixty percent of at least five classroom observations (40-60 minutes each) between October and May of the 1975-1976 school year children whose teachers have completed the designated 13-15 week Creative Dramatics workshop will be observed experiencing the CD techniques sequentially (senses, emotions and feelings, characterization, dialogue, and story dramatization) as recorded on the CD Observational Checklist.

b. Sixty percent of all teachers who have completed the designated 13-15 week Creative Dramatics workshop will implement CD activities (e.g., games, sense memory) to reinforce the development of vocabulary, in 60% of at least five non-consecutive classroom observations (each 40-60 minutes) between October and May of the 1975-1976 school year as recorded on the CD Observational Checklist.

c. Students who have been exposed to CD techniques will improve their writing skills between September and May of the 1975-1976 school year as indicated by a significant gain ($p < .10$) in (a) number of words and (b) number of sentences in stories written as measured by a locally developed Picture Stimulus Test.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a./b. Systematic observations of classrooms of teachers who have completed the CD workshop will be conducted between October and May of the 1975-1976 school year. A random sample of teachers will be selected for observation at the beginning of the school year when the total population of CD teachers have been identified. Data will be recorded on the Creative Dramatics Observational Checklist.

c. A one group, pretest - posttest design will be employed. The picture stimulus test will be administered in October and May to a random sample of students whose teachers have been trained in CD techniques. The number of words and number of sentences in stories written will be counted. A mean for each group will be determined. A t test will be applied at the .10 level of significance.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed		✓												
3. Proposal Accepted		✓												
4. Premeasures Administered				✓										
5. Monitoring of Project			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
6. Mid-Measures Administered	N/A													
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered	N/A									✓				
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev											✓			
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed												✓	✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed													✓	
													✓	

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, MAasuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: EDUCATION IN WORLD AFFAIRS (R) **(PBRS #** 611-03-556**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Margaret Lonzetta

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Lisbeth Sorkin

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. During the school year, all participating 6-8 grade students will gain knowledge of concept of interdependence among nations, similarities and differences of people in the world and of world geography as measured by locally developed tests. Significant differences at the .10 level between pre- and posttest will be accepted as evidence of attainment.

B. Throughout the school year, project liaison persons will introduce all participating students to different cultural attitudes and perspectives, thus providing the students with a broader framework upon which they can formulate their viewpoints. This will be done by means of trips to the United Nations, one guest speaker per unit studied, and in grades 6-8, a supplemental classroom library, four filmstrips per class, four locally prepared booklets per student, and one book that each student may keep. Project materials will be reviewed and activities will be monitored by the evaluation team using the EWA Service Log. The observations will be cross validated by surveying participating teachers in order to verify receipt of services and materials.

C. Special education students who participate throughout the school year will be introduced to the "one world" concept of interdependence among nations. The project will provide a specially planned booklet on the United Nations for each student, at least two books for each student to keep, one audiovisual kit for each classroom per unit, maps, charts and study pictures, three trips locally in addition to the United Nations trip. Project records will be used to verify the delivery of services, and observations will be made by the evaluation team using the EWA Service Log.

D. During the school year, students at the senior high school level will be provided with subscriptions to news publications (e.g., Time, Newsweek, or the New York Times), and six background information briefs prepared by project personnel to enable the students' examination of six timely international issues. Opportunities to interact first hand with at least six experts in related fields will be provided at six educational forums. In addition, students selected from each participating class will attend six special seminars with experts in fields related to the topics studied. Observations and examination of project records will be conducted and recorded using the EWA Service Log.

E. During the school year, sponsoring teachers will be provided with one planning/workshop session (including all materials for planned activities and a guest speaker) geared to increasing their knowledge, perception and skill in dealing with international issues, focusing on the theme of interdependence of nations, as well as cultural attitudes and related questions which arise in class. Examination of project records and observations of the evaluation team will be recorded on the EWA Service Log and used to assess implementation.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A. One third of the participating students in grades 6-8 will be given locally developed pretests and posttests, based on study units, to determine growth. t tests will be used to measure change. Differences at the .10 level will be accepted as significant.

B., C., D. Program materials and activities, including trips, guest speakers, seminars, staff development and efforts of liaison teachers will be monitored by the evaluation team. Observations will be reported using the EWA Service log. Participating teachers will be surveyed and 80% will verify receipt of materials and services.

E. Project records of teacher conferences will be tabulated. Programs will be monitored by the evaluation team and recorded in the EWA Service Log. The information will be reported descriptively.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director														
2. Evaluation Designed														
3. Proposal Accepted														
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE READQNESS (R) **(PBRS #**611-06-504 **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Charles McLauglin **PROJECT EVALUATOR:** Marion Kaplan **INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:** 3

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. Project pupils will develop their readiness skills to the extent that 60% of them attain a raw score of 17 or more on Part 4 (aural comprehension) of the Stanford Early School Achievement Teat (SESAT) administered in May.

b. Project pupils will improve their English language skills to the extent that there will be a significant gain ($p<05$) from September pretest to May posttest on the Elementary School Speaking Test in English and Spanish (English Subtest).

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a. Part 4 (aural comprehension) of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT) will be administered to all project pupils in May. The results will be compared with the minimal level (District 5 mean of 17 correct) designated for success in school.

b. The English subtest of the Elementary School Speaking Test in English and Spanish will be administered in September and May. The total English scores will be compared using Sandler's A-statistqc. A statistically significant difference ($p<.05$) between pretest and posttest scores will be indicative of adequate improvement in the English Language Skills of the project children.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	A
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed			✓											
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered			B											
5. Monitoring of Project				✓		✓		✓		✓				
6. Mid-Measures Administered	N/A													
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed										✓				
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓	✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed													✓	

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES (R) **(PBRS #**611-02-551 **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Eleanor L. Sandstrom

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Robert Offenberg
Bob Epstein

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. Pupils in the ESOL program will demonstrate increased competence in understanding spoken English to the extent that mean scores on the ESOL Test of Aural Comprehension administered in October 1975 and May 1976 will show a statistically significant difference ($p<.10$) when sex, mother tongue, age, years on the mainland prior to study of ESOL, and number of years of prior ESOL instruction are taken into account.

B. Pupils newly enrolled in the program will show increased control of spoken English as demonstrated by a statistically significant gain ($p<.10$) in score on the 1976 revision of the ESOL Screening Test between the time of admission to the program and May/June, 1976.

C. Program staff and program evaluators will establish and maintain a computer file (compatible with the School District's Pupil Directory System to permit long-term follow-up) on every pupil served by the program. Beginning in Fall 1975, the file will provide program schools with information regarding their non-English-dominant pupils.

D. Program staff will formalize the procedures to be used in determining the transfer of pupils from ESOL to the regular school program. These procedures will be developed and disseminated to ESOL teachers and school administrators by December 1975.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A. The ESOL Test of Aural Comprehension (developed in 1974-1975) will be administered to all ESOL students in October 1975 and May 1976 (students tested in October, 1975 and returned to the mainstream of their school will be included in the May, 1976 testing). At each testing, Form A will be administered to half the students and Form B will be administered to the other half. Students tested on Form A in October will be tested on Form B in May, and vice versa. Analysis of variance will be used to assess the statistical significance of changes observed over the year for those pupils present for both tests.

B. The program staff and evaluators will revise the ESOL Screening Test during the summer of 1975. Teachers will administer the revised instrument during the period September 1975 to November 1975 to all pupils newly arrived in the school and who are not native English speakers. Teachers will administer the test in May and June of 1976 to all students who have participated in the program for the first time. Results will be analyzed to show skill areas in which pupils admitted to the program had the greatest need for instruction, and to show the progress made by pretested students during the year. Multivariate analysis of variance will be used to assess the statistical significance of gains made by the pretested group.

C. Program evaluators will provide lists of pupils screened in 1974-1975 from a computerized pupil file being prepared during spring and summer of 1975. In the spring of 1976, these lists will be revised to include decisions made about pupils tested in 1975-1976.

D. Program evaluators will serve as consultants in the formalization of procedures to determine the transfer of pupils from ESOL to regular school programs. They will also record whether the formalization process and its dissemination to schools occurred as planned.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted														
4. Premeasures Administered				✓										
5. Monitoring of Project				✓										
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered											✓	✓		
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev													✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

A. Consultation on computer analyses of data.
B. Instrument development consultation.
C. Revision of existing computerized pupil file.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: FOLLOW THROUGH (R)

(PBRS # 611-01, 02-699 **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: LEONTINE D. SCOTT

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Thomas McNamara, Judith Goodwin, James Welch, Anne Lukshus, Linda Matthews

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

Local Evaluation of Follow Through in Philadelphia through its comprehensive documenting orientation over the past four years has collected sufficient baseline data to be able to provide attainment/non-attainment information on the following specific product and special condition goals:

(see attached)

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

The local Follow Through Evaluation design in Philadelphia is basically a comprehensive documenting system based on the thinking of Messick and Barrows(Messick S. and Barrows, T. Strategies for Research and Evaluation in Early Childhood Education. In Early Childhood Education, Seventy-First NSSE Yearbook, Part II, Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1972, pp. 261-290). As such, the emphasis is on total population characteristics, and descriptive statistics, on major variables such as achievement, length-of-program exposure, pre-kindergarten experience, and yearly absence rates. In addition yearly detailed descriptions are provided of the program's parent involvement and supportive services components.

For goals A to E, the descriptive statistic used to determine significance is that provided by Davis (Davis, F. B. Educational Measurements and Their Interpretation, Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1964) for the standard error of measurement of the difference between means of independent groups.

Data for goals F - L are analyzed straightforwardly in terms of N's and %'s in each category on the recording forms. Similar analyses apply to goals M and N, those special conditions deemed important to satisfactory program functioning.

In addition to data collection and analysis pertinent to the above goals, the evaluation unit will begin to collect comprehensive classroom process data, using the locally developed Classroom Observation Routine (COR) and will obtain program effectiveness ratings from principals, teachers, aides, and parents.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	X													
2. Evaluation Designed		X												
3. Proposal Accepted		X												
4. Premeasures Administered			(Previous year's test data are regarded as pre-measures)											
5. Monitoring of Project				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
6. Mid-Measures Administered						N/A								
7. Interim Report							X							
8. Monitoring Completed											X			
9. Post-Measures Administered								X						
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												X	X	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													X	X
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														X

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

Provision of short-record test tape from February, 1976 city-wide administration.

Product

A. In the February, 1976 city-wide administration of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT), all Kindergarten pupils:

(1) in each of at least five of the seven models in the regular program, and in at least 3/4 of the schools in the expansion program in each district, will obtain a mean raw score in the Letters and Sounds and Mathematics subtests that falls within the same National pupil stanine as was achieved by the total kindergarten group in those same models and schools on the SESAT administered in February, 1975.

(2) in each of at least five of the seven models in the regular program, and in at least 3/4 of the schools in the expansion program in each district, will obtain a mean raw score in the Letters and Sounds and Mathematics subtests that is significantly (.05) higher than that achieved by the total Kindergarten group in each respective district in which the model and schools are located.

B. In the February, 1976 city-wide administration of the California Achievement Test (CAT), all First Grade pupils:

(1) in each of at least four of the seven models in the regular program, and in at least 2/3 of the schools in the expansion program in each district, will obtain a mean Achievement Development Scale Score (ADSS) in Vocabulary or Total Reading, in Mathematics Computation or Total Mathematics, and in Total Language or Spelling that falls within the same National pupil stanine as was achieved by the total First grade group in those same models and schools on the CAT administered in February, 1975.

(2) in each of at least four of seven models in the regular program, and in at least 2/3 of the schools in the expansion program in each district, will obtain a mean ADSS in Vocabulary or Total Reading, in Mathematics Computation or Total Mathematics, and in Total Language or Spelling that is significantly (.05) higher than that achieved by the total First Grade group in each respective district in which the model and schools are located.

C. In the February, 1976 city-wide administration of the California Achievement Test (CAT), all Second grade pupils:

(1) in each of at least four of the seven models in the regular program will obtain a mean ADSS in Comprehension or Total Reading, in Mathematics Concepts and Problem Solving or Total Mathematics, and in Total Language or Total Battery that falls within the same National pupil stanine as was achieved by the total second grade group in these same models on the CAT administered in February, 1975.

(2) in each of at least four of the seven models in the regular program will obtain a mean ADSS in Vocabulary or Total Reading, in Mathematics Computation or Total Mathematics, and in Total Language or Spelling that is significantly (.05) higher than that achieved by the total Non-Follow Through (National Comparison School) second grade group in each model's respective districts, and by all second graders in each respective district in which the models are found.

D. In the February, 1976 city-wide administration of the California Achievement Test (CAT), all Third Grade pupils:

(1) in each of at least four of the seven models in the regular program will obtain a mean ADSS in Comprehension or Total Reading, in Mathematics Concepts and Problem Solving or Total Mathematics, and in Total Language or Spelling that is significantly (.05) higher thant that achieved by the total third grade group in these models in February, 1975.

(2) in each of at least three of the seven models in the regular program will obtain a mean ADSS in Comprehension or Total Reading, in Mathematics Concepts and Problem Solving or Total Mathematics, and in Total Language or Spelling that is significantly (.05) higher than that achieved by the total Non-Follow Through (National Comparison School) third grade group, in each model's Districts, and by all third graders in each respective district in which the models are situated.

E. In the February, 1976 city-wide administration of the California Achievement Test (CAT), all Fourth Grade pupils:

(1) in each of at least four of the seven models in the regular program will obtain a mean ADSS in Comprehension or Total Reading, in Mathematics Concepts and Problem Solving or Total Mathematics, and in Total Language or

Total Battery that is significantly (.05) higher than that achieved by the total fourth grade group in these same models in February, 1975.

(2) in each of at least three of the seven models in the regular program will obtain a mean ADSS in Comprehension or Total Reading, in Mathematics Concepts and Problem Solving or Total Mathematics, and in Total Language or Total Battery that is significantly (.05) higher than that achieved by the total Non-Follow Through (National Comparison School) fourth grade group in each model's respective districts, and by all fourth graders in each respective district in which the models are located.

F. The Executive Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) at each school will involve at least 15 other parents monthly in committee work to plan parent activities, and will work jointly with at least two community action groups on projects in the course of a year. Information regarding these activities is to be drawn from PAC minutes and reported by each school quarterly on forms supplied by the Follow Through Evaluation office.

G. At least 10% of the parent population for each school will attend an on-site open PAC meeting or a district or city-wide PAC meeting monthly; at least 20% of each school's parents will attend a Follow Through related meeting or affair monthly; and at least 70% of the parents in each school will attend one school meeting or affair during the school year. Schools will provide information regarding the above quarterly on forms supplied by the evaluation unit.

H. In each school there will be at least one hour of parent volunteer time monthly to match the number of children in the program. Information to be supplied as above.

I. In each school 100% of the total enrollment will be screened for medical problems by school health services at least; no less than 80% of those pupil referred for medical assistance will be treated by either contracted or non-contracted services arranged for by Follow Through personnel. Information to be provided as above.

J. In each school 100% of the total enrollment will be screened for dental problems by school health services at least; no less than 80% of those referred for dental care will be treated through contracted or non-contracted services arranged for by Follow Through personnel. Information to be provided as above.

K. In each school at least 80% of those pupils referred for psychological services will be examined by either contracted or non-contracted agencies; either treatment or consultation for 100% of those examined will be provided by contracted or non-contracted agencies arranged for by Follow Through personnel. Information will be provided as above.

L. At least 85% of each school's families will be visited at least once by the community coordinator* during the school year; the coordinator or social worker serving the school will identify all families in need of social services and will be consistently engaged in helping at least 50% of these families to secure the services needed from agencies in the community. Information to be provided as above.

Special Conditions

M. To insure that teacher retention rates are sufficiently high to allow for the required continuity of treatment within Follow Through, it is expected that the rate of teacher continuance in the program for the four year span 1972-73 to 1975-76 will be at least 60%. Data will be secured from School District records.

N. To insure that pupil retention rates are sufficiently high to provide for the program's planned longitudinal effect, it is expected that the overall rate of pupil continuance for the four years 1972-73 to 1975-76 will be at least 60%. Data will be secured by regular updating of the Follow Through pupil file from the School District's Pupil Directory System.

---

* Follow Through School Community Coordinator

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Institutions for Neglected and Delinquent Children (R) (**PBRS #**611-05-587)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Lurlene Sweeting

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Judith Green Leibovitz

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 3

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. Each institution which provides mathematics instruction in this project will provide it from October to June to its underachieving children for a minimum of two hours per week per child. Detailed logs of the duration and content of each session will be maintained.

b. Each institution which provides reading instruction in this project will provide it from October to June to its underachieving children for a minimum of two hours per week per child. Detailed logs of the duration and content of each session will be maintained.

c. Each institution which provides cultural trips in this project will provide them for its disadvantaged children a minimum of one trip per month per child from October to June. Detailed logs indicating individual participants will be maintained.

d. Students receiving at least five weeks of mathematics instruction in this project during the 1975-1976 school year will improve their basic mathematics skills to the extent that teachers using the Institution Skill Record for Mathematics at the end of the students respective participation in the project will rate 75% of them as having gained additional knowledge of numeration, fractions, addition, subtraction, word problems, geometry, and symbols, multiplication, division, mental computation, numerical reasoning, work problems, missing elements, money, measurement, and time.

e. Students recieving at least five weeks of reading instruction in this project during the 1975-1976 school year will improve their basic reading skills to the extent that teachers using the Institution Skill Record for Reading at the end of the students respective participation in the project will rate 75% of them as having gained additional knowledge of word recognition skills, comprehension, oral reading or study skills.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a./b./c. For the three objectives, the project director or instructor will fill in weekly logs of service provided, children to whom service is provided, and the amount of time service is provided for each child.

Field visits by evaluator will verify and substantiate logs.

d. The Institution Skill Record for Mathematics will be administered to each student receiving at least five weeks of mathematics instruction at the end of a student's-participation in the project.

e. The Institution Skill Record for Reading will be administered to each student receiving at least five weeks of reading instruction at the end of a student's-participation in the project.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed			✓											
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered	N/A													
5. Monitoring of Project			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered	ADMINISTERED WHEN CHILD LEAVES INSTITUTION													
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓	✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed													✓	

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: LEARNING CENTERS (R) (**PBRS #**611-02-541)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Lore Rassmusen
PROJECT EVALUATOR: Thomas Clark
INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. 1. Pupils in Learning Center labs will attain significantly higher ($p<.10$) scores in concept formation in mathematics over that of comparable groups of non-participating pupils as evidenced by the Key Mathematics Diagnostic Arithmetic Test administered in April 1976.

2. Pupils in Learning Center labs, on the average, will gain at least two (2) instructional levels in total mathematics ability as evidenced by 80% mastery on the respective Philadelphia School Mathematics Levels Tests administered in September 1975 and May 1976.

3. Pupils in the F. Douglass communications lab will attain significantly higher ($p<.10$) scores in language arts components of communications effectiveness in oral and written form over that of comparable groups of non-participating pupils as evidenced by a locally developed Picture Stimulus Test.

TEACHER-PARENT CENTER

B. 1. Teachers who have been voluntary participants in the Teacher-Parent Center will report changes in teacher behavior and understanding of the learning center approach as evidenced by classroom atmosphere, materials selection, teacher behavior and pupil behavior as indicated by a Teacher-Parent Center Survey (self-report).

2. Teachers who have been voluntary participants in the Teacher-Parent center for at least two years will indicate changes in their teacher behavior toward the affective areas of Teacher-Pupil interaction toward a guidance point of view as indicated by an Observational Checklist.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A. 1. The Key Math Test will be used to measure pupils' mathematics concept formation skills. The test will be used to compare project pupils' (where appropriate) achievements with comparison groups. A t test will be used to measure statistical differences between groups. The test will be administered to randomly-selected pupils.

2. The Philadelphia School Mathematics Levels Test will be administered (where appropriate) to all LC pupils in September to determine an entry level on the Test. The same pupils will be given the test in May 1976 in order to determine gain of at least two instructional levels.

3. The Picture Stimulus Test will be administered to measure pupils' abilities to communicate effectively both in oral and written form. A t test will be applied to compare project pupils' achievements with comparison groups of pupils [illegible] the F. Douglass School. The test will be administered to randomly-selected pupils.

TEACHER-PARENT CENTER

B. 1. A locally developed Teacher-Parent Survey will be administered to a 50% random sample of teachers who have voluntarily participated in the T-P center. The instrument will report changes in their teacher behavior and understanding of the learning center approach to instruction.

2. A locally-developed Observational Checklist will be used to measure changes in teacher behavior toward the affective areas of teacher-pupil interaction of a 50% random sample of teachers who have been voluntary participants of the T-P center for at least two years.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director											X			
2. Evaluation Designed												X		
3. Proposal Accepted												X		
4. Premeasures Administered			A2											
5. Monitoring of Project			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed											X			
9. Post-Measures Administered								B2	A1	A3	A2 B1			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: MEET THE ARTIST (R) (**PBRS #** 611-02-513)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Jack Bookbinder

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Arnold Escourt

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: #4

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. Eighty percent of the pupils accepted into the project will attend at least 28 of the project's 35 sessions as verified by evaluators' inspection of attendance records.

B. Eighty percent of the participating pupils will complete at least six art projects in various media (e.g. drawing, painting, print making, sculpture) as verified by evaluators' inspection of teacher records.

C. Eighty percent of the participating pupils will display at an exhibition at least one of their projects, as indicated by teacher records and verified by evaluators' monitoring.

D. Eighty percent of the pupils will participate in at least three project - sponsored visits to three cultural sites, as verified by evaluators' inspection of logs.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A/B/C Teachers records will be used by evaluators to verify these objectives.

C. Evaluators will take a random sampling of 10% of participating students to verify the existence of at least 80% of them having one of their creations on exhibit.

D. Project directors logs will be used to verify this objective.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed													✓	✓
9. Post-Measures Administered														✓
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Motivation (R) **(PBRS #** 611-04-555 **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Rebecca Segal

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Joseph Meade

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. Motivation students will score significantly ($p<.05$) higher on the Total Reading Subtest of the California Achievement Test than a comparable group of students chosen for the project but attending schools not eligible for Title I funds during the 1975-1976 school year.

B. Motivation students will score significantly ($p<.05$) higher on the Verbal Subtest of the Scholastic Aptitude Test than a comparable group of students chosen for the project but attending schools not eligible for Title I funds during 1975-1976 school year.

C. Motivation students will score significantly ($p<.05$) higher on the Quantitative Subtest of the Scholastic Aptitude Test than a comparable group of students chosen for the project but attending schools not eligible for Title I funds during the 1975-1976 school year.

D. Motivation students will be accepted for admission at colleges and universities in significantly higher percentages ($p<.05$) than a comparable group of students chosen for the project but attending schools not eligible for Title I funds during the 1975-1976 school year.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

The following evaluation techniques will be used on a group of 95 Motivation students and a comparison group of 95 non-Motivation students chosen in 1973 for a longitudinal study.

A. Motivation and non-Motivation students will be administered the California Achievement Test (reading) in February. The t test will be used to detect differences between the two groups.

B. Motivation and non-Motivation students will be administered the Scholastic Aptitude Test (verbal) during the 1975-1976 school year. The t test will be used to detect differences between the two groups.

C. Motivation and non-Motivation students will be administered the Scholastic Aptitude Test (quantitative) during the 1975-1976 school year. The t test will be used to detect differences between the two groups.

D. Percentages of students in the two groups accepted for admission at colleges universities will be compared using the X^2 test.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AU
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered	N/A													
5. Monitoring of Project				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
6. Mid-Measures Administered	N/A													
7. Interim Report								✓						
8. Monitoring Completed										✓				
9. Post-Measures Administered								AB			CD			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓		
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Multimedia Center (R) (**PBRS #**611-06-615)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Charles McLaughlin

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Thomas Clark

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 3

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. During the current school year, the Multimedia Center will provide audiovisual and other instructional materials that are related to the curricular needs of educationally deprived pupils. It is expected that the teachers will use an average of 35 materials during the year as measured by the Multimedia Center Survey.

b. During the school year, the coordinator of the Multimedia Center will provide paraprofessional aides with a minimum of 2 1/2 hours of in-service training in the classroom use of audiovisual and other instructional materials. An activity log of the training will be maintained by the coordinator.

c. During the school year, the coordinator of the Multimedia Center will provide sixth-grade students selected by their schools for participation in Cadet Corps with a minimum of 1 1/2 hours of training in the use of audiovisual hardware. An activity log of the training will be maintained by the coordinator.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a. Summary information of the number and kinds of materials circulated by the Multimedia Center will be provided by the Multimedia Center coordinator. This information will be reported in descriptive terms. Teachers in each participating school will complete the Multimedia Center Survey. Respondents will indicate the frequency and type of use of various materials. They will also rate the adequacy of Center services. The responses to the Survey will be summarized and subsequently reported in descriptive terms.

b. The Multimedia Center coordinator will maintain a log listing (a) school and name of aide, (b) type of training given, and (c) length of training. The information will be summarized and reported in descriptive terms. In order to provide cross-validation of the information provided, a sample of aides will complete the Multimedia Center In-Service Form for Aides to indicate the type and length of in-service received.

c. The Multimedia Center coordinator will maintain a log listing (a) school and number of students trained, (b) type of training given, and (c) length of training. The information will be summarized and reported in descriptive terms. In order to provide cross-validation of the information provided, the principals of the schools participating in Cadet Corps will complete the Multimedia Center Principal's Evaluation of Cadet Corps. They will rate the performance of the students and provide a list of the equipment for which the students are responsible for operating.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered	N/A													
5. Monitoring of Project						✓					✓			
6. Mid-Measures Administered	N/A													
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed											✓			
9. Post-Measures Administered									a,b,c		a			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓	✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

Revision of Multimedia Center Survey

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: OUT-OF-SCHOOL SEQUENCED SCIENCE EXPERIENCES (**PBRS #**611-02-653)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Fred M. Hofkin

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Ethel K. Goldberg

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 4

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

1. At the end of six days of instruction (one day per week over a six-week period) at the Franklin Institute, pupils from one selected learning cycle will demonstrate improved knowledge and understanding of selected basic concepts of physical and biological science as measured by the Franklin Institute Science Achievement Test. Pretest to posttest gains exceeding $p<.05$ will be accepted as evidence of meaningful progress.

2. During each six-week cycle, pupils of different socioethnic and racial backgrounds will exchange ideas and show an attitude of cooperative work relationships as indicated by the Social-Interaction Observational Checklist so that positive interaction will exceed negative interaction by 90%.

3. During each six-week cycle all pupils will have been provided with science-content-based language arts activities (including the completion of a minimum of six worksheets and the production of a science newsletter) as determined by a Project-Specific Observational Checklist and a Teacher Questionnaire.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

1. The attainment of the cognitive objectives will be measured by the Franklin Institute Science Achievement Test (KR_{20}=.85) developed to measure cognitive learning resulting from the Franklin Institute experiences and related field trips, as stated in Objective 1. Pretest to posttest gains for students in one cycle will be examined by a repeated measures analysis of variance with $p<.05$.

2. During approximately 20 visits systematic monitoring will be conducted throughout the four cycles to describe the project and determine if the Franklin Institute will have provided conditions considered prerequisite for the attainment of the project's previously stated objectives. A Social-Interaction Observational Checklist, developed by the Office of Research and Evaluation and especially designed to measure the amount of constructive interaction occurring between children from the paired schools, will be used. Summary tallies of observations, computed to illustrate the amount and kind of social interaction occurring during Institute and field trip activities, will be examined to determine if positive interaction will have exceeded negative interaction by 90%.

3. During the monitoring visits a Project-Specific Checklist and a Teacher Questionnaire will be used to measure the degree to which a learning environment exists in which students are encouraged to improve their language arts skills. Summary tallies of observations will be examined to determine if a minimum of six science worksheets have been completed as well as whether other learning activities will have been conducted (including the production of a science newsletter).

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered							✓							
5. Monitoring of Project			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report						✓								
8. Monitoring Completed											✓			
9. Post-Measures Administered								✓						
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev													✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														✓
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: SCHOOL COMMUNITY COORDINATOR (R) **(PBRS #** 611-17-505 **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: George Green **PROJECT EVALUATOR:** Arnold Escourt **INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:** #2

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. The SCCS will make a minimum of seventy-five home contacts with adults each month, relative to participating ESEA, Title I students, which shall include contacts concerned with beginning attendance problems, referrals emanating from school requests and self-initiated visits intended to improve school community communication. This will be verified by inspection of monthly logs that will be maintained by the SCCS.

b. The SCCS will plan and execute a minimum of one cluster meeting for parents or guardians of participating ESEA, Title I students each month for the purpose of sharing information related to school and/or community matters. A cluster meeting is a gathering of three or more parents attending an announced/scheduled meeting. This will be verified by inspection of monthly logs that will be maintained by the SCCS.

c. The SCCS will attend faculty meetings and discuss the School Community Coordinators Project and/or the needs of participating ESEA, Title I students at a minimum of two such meetings during the year. This will be verified by inspection of monthly logs that will be maintained by the SCCS.

d. The SCCS will assist parents of participating ESEA, Title I students in understanding and completing the application for the free-and-reduced-price school lunch program when they request such service. This will be verified by inspection of monthly logs that will be maintained by the SCCS.

e. The SCCS will attend, as their schools' designated representatives, a minimum of two community meetings per month. This will be verified by inspection of monthly logs that will be maintained by the SCCS.

f. The SCCS will develop and distribute a minimum of one written communication per month related to Title I services to parents or guardians of participating ESEA, Title I students. This will be verified by inspection of monthly logs that will be maintained by the SCCS.

g. The Area Coordinators will assist and monitor the School Community Coordinators and act as another communication link between the school and especially the parents and guardians of participating ESEA, Title I students. The Area Coordinators will disseminate information to the School Community Coordinators and the community. This will be verified by inspections of monthly logs that will be maintained by Area Coordinators.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

Objectives a/b/c/d/e/f. To measure objectives a,b,c,d,e,f, SCCs will record their daily activities on a SCC activity log sheet. They will then summarize the data onto a monthly activity log. The data from the logs will be collected monthly and tabulated. An overall average and standard deviation across all SCCs for all reported months will be computed in June 1976 in reporting the attainment of objectives. The evaluation team will visit a random sample of 20% of the schools with a SCC. Principals, SCCs, teachers and whenever possible, a parent or guardian of a participating ESEA, Title I student, will be asked to complete a questionnaire to ascertain the perceptions of project related persons about the role and function of the SCC and the effectiveness of the SCC project, and to validate activities reported by the School Community Coordinators and the Area Coordinator.

Objective g. For objective g, the Area Coordinator will record a separate log that documents her weekly activities. She will then summarize the data onto a monthly activity log. An overall average and standard deviation across all Area Coordinators for all reported months will be computed in June 1976 in reporting the degree of attainment of this objective.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AU
1. Conference with Project Director	X													
2. Evaluation Designed	X													
3. Proposal Accepted	X													
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project			A-G	A-G	A-G	A-G	A-G	A-G	A-G	A-G	A-G			
6. Mid-Measures Administered			A-G	A-G	A-G	A-G	A-G	A-G	A-G	A-G	A-G			
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed											X			
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												X	X	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														X
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														X

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

The multipurpose questionnaire form must be run by May 11, 1975 and assistance to run the ITEMS R program is required to analyze the data by May 7, 1975.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Speech and Hearing (R) (**PBRS #** 611-06-720)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Charles McLaughlin **PROJECT EVALUATOR:** William E. Loue III **INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:** 3

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. Pupils receiving therapy for the correction of defective sounds will experience correction of those sounds to the extent that there will be a statistically significant gain ($p < .05$) from their mean October pre-test to their mean May post-test on the Templin-Darley Diagnostic Test of Articulation.

b. At the completion of the project term, seventy percent (70%) of all project pupils receiving therapy for stuttering will show a decrease in the severity and/or incidences of stuttering behaviors as evidenced by ratings of at least "improved" by their respective therapists on the Stuttering Evaluation survey form.

c. At the completion of the project term, twenty percent (20%) of the pupils receiving therapy for the correction of defective sounds and 15% of the pupils receiving therapy for stuttering will be dismissed from further therapy with the note "dismissed corrected" recorded on both the Defective Articulation Summary and the Stuttering Evaluation forms.

d. At the completion of the project term, 50% of all pupils receiving therapy for defective hearing will improve at least one of their defective auditory skills as evidenced by the hearing specialist's rating (of "improved") on the Hearing Handicapped Summary form.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a. The Templin-Darley Diagnostic Test of Articulation will be administered to a 20% randomly selected sample of project pupils with defective sounds in October and May. Mean pretest and posttest scores will be compared using a correlated t test at the .05 level of significance.

b. At the conclusion of the school year (May), each therapist will classify all stuttering pupils as "improved," "remained the same," or "regressed" on the stuttering evaluation summary form. A rating of "improved" for 70% of the cases will be considered ideal.

c. All pupils with articulation defects who have been dismissed as corrected by the therapists will be recorded on the Defective Articulation Summary forms. A total of 20% of the pupils receiving this rating will be considered ideal.

All pupils with stuttering defects who have been dismissed as corrected by the therapists will be recorded on the Stuttering Evaluation Form. A total of 15% of the pupils receiving this rating will be considered ideal.

d. Detailed case studies will be completed by the hearing therapist for each pupil (projected number of 15) in her caseload. The case analysis will include ratings of the auditory skills of each child on the Hearing Handicapped Summary. These skills include (1) discrimination of direction, location, and distance of voice (2) discrimination of individual voices (male-female, etc., (3) discrimination of speech sounds, (4) discrimination of words in and out of context, etc. The ratings will indicate in which auditory skills the pupils has improved, regressed or remained the same. It is expected that 50% of these pupils will improve at least one of these auditory skills.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered				A										
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered				✓			✓				✓			
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed											✓			
9. Post-Measures Administered											A,B, C,D			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓		
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

***=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.**

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: WALNUT CENTER (R) **(PBRS #** 611-01-517**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: FRANCES BECKER

PROJECT EVALUATOR: WILLIAM LOUEIII
LISBETH SORKIN

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. Kindergarten children will develop readiness skills in reading and arithmetic as evidenced by standardized test results administered in February. (i.e., 50% of the children will score at or above the 50th percentile)

b. First-grade children will develop basic skills in reading and arithmetic as evidenced by standardized test results administered in February. (i.e., 50% of the children will score at or above the 50th percentile)

c. The Center will provide medical, psychological, psychiatric, speech and social service professional care to all pupils on an "as-needed" basis as indicated by school records and observations by the evaluation team.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A posttest monitoring design will be used to assess this project. Standardized tests will be administered and periodic observations will be made by the evaluation team. School records will also be utilized.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director														
2. Evaluation Designed														
3. Proposal Accepted														
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: YOUNG AUDIENCES (R) **(PBRS #** 611-02-514**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Edwin E. Heilakka **PROJECT EVALUATOR:** Arnold Escourt **INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:** [illegible]

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. The project will provide ten 45 minutes live musical presentations to target area pupils in grades 3-6 only, as verified by evaluators' monitoring.

B. At the end of the school year, project pupils will score significantly higher ($p<.20$) than a control group of nonproject pupils on a test measuring their ability to recognize and identify standard musical instruments(e.g. brass, woodwind, string and percussion.); their knowledge of basic musical concepts such as melody, harmony,rhythm and form; and their understanding of basic concepts of science of music, such as the effect on sound of closed and open pipes, tension and vibration.

C. Professional musicians will give 12 classroom musical presentations in three secondary RE centers, as verified by inspection of the project administrator's records and monitoring of programs by an evaluation team.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A. A random sampling of 30% of participating schools will be visited by an evaluation team.

B. In September, participating schools will submit the names of all teachers in grades 3-6. The evaluators will randomly assign half of the teachers and their classes to be part of the experimental group and the other half as the control group. An instrument measuring the three areas will be developed in the summer of 1975 and will be administered to the control and expermental groups at the beginning and the end of the year. The Fishers "t" test for the total mean score will be used to determine significant differences for the two groups ($p<.20$).

C. Project director's records will be used to determine whether 12 sessions in three RE centers were held. The evaluators will visit the three centers at least once in monitoring the presentations.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	X													
2. Evaluation Designed	X													
3. Proposal Accepted	X													
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project				A.C.	A.C.	A.C.	A.C.	A.C.	A.C.	A.C.				
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report							A.C.							
8. Monitoring Completed										A.C.				
9. Post-Measures Administered										B				
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												X		
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													X	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														X

***=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.**

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

An instrument measuring the three areas (noted in objective I) must be developed during the summer 1975 so that it can be administered in October 1975. Programming Assistance is required to set up an SAS or F4STAT program in May 1975 to analyze the data.

SUMMER TERM PROJECTS

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Affective Education (S) **(PERS #** 611 **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Norman Newberg

PROJECT EVALUATOR: William E. Loue III

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. To prepare training designs and training materials to be used in the development of teachers in their use of the Communications Curriculum and Parent-Child Rituals.

b. To develop new materials, methods and delivery systems for the provision of resource services to teachers.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a. The submission of new training designs and materials which will aid the teacher to use the Parent-Child Rituals and the Communications Curricula by 1 September 1976 will constitute successful completion of this objective.

b. The submission of new materials and a plan which describes methods and delivery systems pertaining to Resource Services for teachers, by 1 September 1976 will constitute successful achievement of this objective.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project	✓													
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

NONE

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: BENCHMARK (S) **(PBRS #** 611-02-507**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Edmund Forte

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Arnold Escourt

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 3

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. To increase the skills of Benchmark teachers in the interpretation of achievement scores, administration, scoring, and interpretation of diagnostic tests and rating scales, classroom management, use of instructional materials, and supervision of instructional aides and volunteers.

b. To increase the skills of Benchmark instructional aides in group and individual instructional assistance, clerical functions, use of teaching aids including audiovisual equipment.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a/b On-site evaluation and monitoring and a teacher and aide questionnaire to be developed by the evaluation staff will be used to evaluate the summer project.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed		✓												
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														A/B
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														*
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														*
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														*

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, MAasuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Bilingual Education (S) (**PBRS #** 611-06-538)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Charles McLaughlin

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Marion Kaplan

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 4

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. To plan for the effective implementation of the project's activities in the Fall of 1976. The activities engaged in over the course of the summer will include:

(1) Evaluation - a review of the data gathered in execution of the evaluation design for the school year 1975-76 including student records, teacher evaluations, principals' recommendations, parents' comments and other managerial observations.

(2) Curriculum Planning - design of the program for the fall in order to meet the general and individual needs of the children. Specific areas for revision are:

Materials - selection and development

In- Service Workshops - preparation for in-service experiences for teachers and aides in September 1976.

(3) Administrative Requirements

Publish handbooks for teachers, parents and students
Prepare cumulative records for Cerino Center students
Publish job descriptions and expectations for each position in the project.
Revise record keeping procedures
Revise reports of pupil progress
Develop a calendar of events
Develop and initqate plans for a parent-teachers group.

A summer activity log will be maintained by the Bilingual Education Project coordinator.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

The coordinator of the Bilingual Education Project will submit a summary of the summer activities. This information will indicate the degree to which each of the listed activities has been accomplished.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered													✓	
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														✓
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE MATHEMATICS PROJECT - S (PBRS #Pending)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Alex Tobin

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Arnold Escourt

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 4

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

The summer staff-development program will provide participating teachers with the following:

(a) Those methods, techniques, and procedures that will enhance the mathematics concepts and computational skills of pupils.

(b) Effective methods of utilizing the results of the Philadelphia Mathematics Evaluation Test and the California Achievement Tests to improve pupil achievement.

(c) Techniques and materials needed to implement an ongoing "mathematics levels" approach in teaching mathematics to junior high and middle school pupils.

(d) Experiences, activities, and methods which will lead to effective individualization of instruction of pupils.

The program coordinator and members of the mathematics department staff will plan and implement the program. The project staff will record program events and report on the level of implementation.

6/13/75

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

The summer program will be monitored by program staff and by the evaluation team. Questionnaires will be distributed prior to the conclusion of the program to assess the perceptions of the participants as to content and usefulness.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director											✓			
2. Evaluation Designed												✓		
3. Proposal Accepted														
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed													✓	
9. Post-Measures Administered													✓	
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														✓
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT:	COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT Aide Service (S) Part B				**(PBRS #**611-02-503 **)**
PROJECT DIRECTOR:	Joan Myers	**PROJECT EVALUATOR:**	Arnold Escourt	**INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:**	4

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

The project director will plan for the new year, reassess the past years performance, prepare materials and services to support the library aide program.

A descriptive report of these activities will be completed by the project director on or before September first.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A report will be written by the project director assessing the summer activities.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director												✓		
2. Evaluation Designed												✓		
3. Proposal Accepted												✓		
4. Premeasures Administered N/A														
5. Monitoring of Project N/A														
6. Mid-Measures Administered N/A														
7. Interim Report N/A														
8. Monitoring Completed N/A														
9. Post-Measures Administered N/A														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														✓
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: The Comprehensive Reading Program District 1 (S) **(PBRS #** **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Verneta Harvey **PROJECT EVALUATOR:** Sherrie Rose **INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:** 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

Elementary

1. To provide participating teachers with techniques for using resource materials present in the Instructional Materials Center (I.M.C.) to develop guidelines for teaching a structured literature program.

2. To provide participating teachers with techniques for teaching reading in the content areas.

Secondary

1. To provide participating secondary consultants and supervisors with resources (test results, etc.) necessary to analyze and interpret progress of the secondary schools in order to develop a handbook of successful programs and practices to be distributed to other school personnel.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

Elementary

Techniques and materials developed will be implemented through staff development beginning in September. Evaluation in the form surveys of classroom teachers involved in the program will occur at periodic intervals.

Secondary

The handbook of successful programs and practices will be distributed to school personnel. The quality and quantity of the handbook will be measured by the amount of feedback and additional contributions from teachers.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed		✓												
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev													✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Comprehensive Reading Program
District Two (S)

(PBRS #)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Mr. Michael Iannelli

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Mr. James Scheib

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. To improve reading instruction through continuous in-service training of staff members.

B. To help teachers up date their knowledge and techniques related to the reading process through a program which actively involves them in its implementation.

C. To develop instructional leadership ability in each school and to maximize the use of instructional leadership through continuous in-service training of district staff members.

D. To provide, at district level, an instructional plan for the teaching/learning process of reading that is flexible enough to allow for the needs of each school.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

Evaluation of the workshop will be by a questionnaire developed to allow teachers, instructional leadership, and administrators to react to the following kinds of questions:

1. Were the objectives and procedures consonant with your needs?
2. Were practical ideas and suggestions offered?
3. Was the on-going evaluation task shared by teachers, instructional leadership, and administrators?

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed		✓												
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE READING PROGRAM DISTRICT 3 (S)

(PBRS #)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Arthur Romanelli

PROJECT EVALUATOR: James Scheib

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

1. To examine the results of the 1975-1976 Reading Project by studying data obtained through the administration of standardized tests and other available information.

2. To establish to what degree the 1975-1976 Reading Project objectives were met.

3. To examine results of monitoring instruments developed during the 1975-1976 school year to establish and refine baseline data and target group objectives for 1976-1977.

4. To revise the 1976-1977 reading plan to conform to any recent changes in school organizations.

5. To prepare the following materials for the 1976-1977 school year based upon a study of the 1975-1976 results:

   a. Books and Supplies

   b. District Three Elementary Teachers Reading Handbook.. (Revision and up-dating)

   c. District Three Secondary Reading Teachers Handbook. (Revision and up-dating)

   d. Appropriate Administrative Bulletins.

6. To clarify and arrange final details for "Start of Year" (1976-1977) staff development programs.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

The evaluation of the 1976 Summer Term will be based upon the degree to which the objectives are met. A checklist will be used to determine if:

1a. A detailed examination of standardized and informal tests administered during the 1975-1976 school year has taken place.

1b. Significant information concerning the 1975-1976 Reading Project, other than test data, has been examined.

2. The objectives of the 1975-1976 Reading Project have been examined and the degree to which they were met has been established.

3. Baseline data has been formulated and target group objectives established from monitoring instruments utilized during 1975-1976 school year.

4. Necessary revisions have been made because of changes in school organizations.

5a. Books and other materials needed for the 1976-1977 school year have been delivered to schools.

5b. The elementary and secondary reading teacher handbooks and other appropriate "Start of the Year" (1976-1977) bulletins have been prepared.

6. Final arrangements fom "Start of the Year" (1976-1977) staff development programs have been completed.

			1975								1976			
EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed		✓												
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered								✓						
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: THE COMPREHENSIVE READING PROGRAM
District Four (S)

(PBRS #)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Katherine Jackson

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Sherry Rose

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

To provide elementary pupils the opportunity for continued growth in Language Arts through exposure to informal Language Arts activities at the District Library Reading Centers in the form of films, filmstrips, storytelling books, magazines, creative dramatics) to the extent that pupils will exhibit motivation as determined by increased participation in the program and use of the facility.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

The following records will be kept at each Center, and summary data will be computed at the end of the program:

Daily attendance count
Count of frequency with which books are borrowed
Teacher log of activities

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed		✓												
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Comprehensive Reading Program
District 5 (S)

(PBRS #)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Irving Rosen

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Alan Soloman

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

From July 1 to August 3 the District 5 Research Assistant will:

a. Reduce and analyze data generated in the regular term
b. Aid in the preparation of reports based on this data
c. Plan activities for the 1975-1976 school year

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A report detailing the Research Assistants' activities will be prepared. It will be written by the Research Assistant.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed		✓												
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE READING PROGRAM DISTRICT 7 (S)

(PBRS #)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Reeda Kravinsky

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Alan Solomon

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. To produce a sequential staff development program for district language arts consultants.

b. To plan a monthly staff development program for language skills teachers.

c. To classify and assign monitoring tasks to district personnel.

d. To organize and display sample materials, letters and curriculum guides.

e. To plan school visitations.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A report will be written and submitted at end of summer session.

This report will indicate the degree of success attained.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed		✓												
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

Comprehensive Reading Program

PROJECT: LARC **(PBRS #**611-02-660 **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Margarie Farmer

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Thomas Clark

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 2

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. At the end of six weeks, children will have been provided with a minimum of five verbal functioning experiences (e.g., story-telling, creative drama) as determined by an Observational Checklist and by a LARC Teacher Questionnaire.

b. At the end of six weeks, children will increase the quantity of their writings by 10% through production of camp newspapers and other creative writings as determined by the LARC Teacher Questionnaire.

c. At the end of six weeks, children will significantly increase ($p<.10$) the quantity of their writing from pretest to posttest, on a locally developed Picture Stimulus Test as measured by word counts.

d. By the end of six weeks, children will have developed a greater appreciation of literature by voluntarily reading at least two paperback books as determined by the LARC Teacher Questionnaire.

e. During the six weeks of LARC, youth corps representatives will provide constructive help in language arts activities to younger children, individually and in groups, as determined by an Observational Checklist and a LARC Teacher Questionnaire.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

1a. Each camp will be monitored twice using an Observational Checklist to record verbal functioning experiences. A Teacher Questionnaire will document specific activities. The data will be summarized in narrative form.

b. Writing activities will be monitored through the use of performance checklists and a Teacher Questionnaire. Data will be summarized descriptively.

c. An evaluator-developed picture-stimulus test will be administered at the beginning and end of the program to randomly selected LARC children. A *t* test of significance will be applied.

d. The number of books read by camp participants will be documented by a checklist maintained by the language arts teacher. The checklist will be summarized in narrative form.

e. The involvement of youth corps representatives with LARC will be monitored twice using an Observational Checklist to record help given in language arts instruction. The language arts teacher will also record specific activities in language arts through the use of a performance checklist. The data will be summarized descriptively.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director												✓		
2. Evaluation Designed												✓		
3. Proposal Accepted												✓		
4. Premeasures Administered													✓	
5. Monitoring of Project													✓	✓
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														✓
9. Post-Measures Administered														✓
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

[illegible]=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPREHENSIVE READING PROGRAM
Summer Reading Readiness (R) **(PBRS #** 611-06-733**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Charles McLaughlin **PROJECT EVALUATOR:** William E. Loue III **INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:** 3

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. At the conclusion of the six-week project term, at least 60% of the pre-first-grade pupils who attend at least 75% of the project sessions will acquire skills in aural comprehension (such as, abilities to pay attention to, organize, infer and retain what has been heard) as indicated by the attainment of a score of at least 18 corrected items out of 28 on Part 4, Aural Comprehension, of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT).

b. At the conclusion of the six-week project term, at least 65% of the underachieving first-grade pupils who attend at least 75% of the project sessions will improve their basic reading-readiness skills to the extent indicated by:

1. mastery of consonants and vowels specified for their respective entry levels, such mastery recorded on the Summer Readiness Project Diagnostic Profile and

2. recognition of at least 15 new words (or mastery of the entire list) on the Sight Word List.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a. At the conclusion of the Project (August) the Aural Comprehension section (Part 4) of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT) will be administered to all pre-first year children. Those children who attended at least 75% of the project sessions and who attained a mastery score of 18 or more correct items (maximum score = 28) will be determined (a score of 18 was the mean score obtained by children completing Kindergarten in Districts 2 and 4 of the School District of Philadelphia, the primary districts in which the Summer Reading Readiness project sites will be located). A total of 60% or more of the children attaining the mastery score will be the measurable criterion of success for the project.

b. The Diagnostic Profile will be completed by the present first-year teacher indicating the child's present level of functioning and the elements of that level which the child has not yet mastered. The teacher should also circle any word on the Sight Word List which the child does not recognize at sight.

The summer teacher will use these ratings as a basis for an individual prescription for each child's summer experience. At the conclusion of the project, the summer teacher will also complete the Diagnostic Profile for each child indicating the child's level of functioning. The summer teacher will also circle any word on the Sight Word List which the child does not recognize at sight.

(Attachment)

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project												✓	✓	
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed													✓	
9. Post-Measures Administered													✓	
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														✓
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														✓
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: COMPUTER MANAGED INSTRUCTION (S) (**PBRS #** 611-24-846)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: SYLVIA CHARP

PROJECT EVALUATOR: THOMAS CLARK

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 4

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. To develop and/or select additional off-line instructional materials and continue identification, classification, and codification of existing materials necessary for operation of the project during the school year.

B. To adapt existent instructional materials to the project strategies and techniques.

C. To continue development of computer programs necessary for implementation of the project.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

Logs will be maintained by the project staff to document the development activities and summarized by the evaluator in narrative form.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed			✓											
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Counseling Services (S) **(PBRS #** 611-06-614**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Albert Bell

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Marion Kaplan

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. During the summer, the project staff will provide psychodiagnostic testing and evaluation for at least 210 pupils referred for academic, emotional, or social problems. Project staff will complete an individual Case Record Form for each pupil referred for this service.

B. During the summer, the project staff will provide remedial counseling service (including referral to appropriate health and social agencies where required) to at least 175 pupils identified as experiencing academic, emotional, or social problems. Project staff will complete an individual Case Record Form for each pupil receiving this service.

C. During the summer, the project staff will provide an individualized learning-therapy program for at least 30 pupils identified as having severe reading disabilities. The project staff will complete an Individualized Learning Therapy Case Record Form for each student receiving this service.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A. Data from the Individualized Case Records will be compiled to indicate the number of pupils receiving psychodiagnosis of academic, emotional, and social problems.

B. Procedures will be similar to those described under A.

C. Procedures will be similar to those described under A, utilizing data from the Individualized Learning Therapy Case Record Forms.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed			✓											
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project													✓	
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed													✓	
9. Post-Measures Administered													ABC	
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev													✓	✓
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														✓
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

***=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.**

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: English to Speakers of Other Languages (S) **(PBRS #**611-02-551**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Eleanor L. Sandstrom

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Robert M. Offenberg
Robert Epstein

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. To assess the competencies of students, whose native language is not English, who come to the ESL Bicultural Intensive Learning Center from all areas of the city in terms of their competencies in understanding, speaking, reading, and writing English by an oral-aural screening test and informal reading and writing inventories.

b. To provide instruction in order to develop oral-aural skills in English, to improve reading comprehension in English and to develop self-expression in English in written form through appropriate instructional activities.

c. To provide instruction in order to develop reading skills and basic arithmetic skills and concepts in Spanish through appropriate instructional activities.

d. To participate in learning about the history and culture of Puerto Rico as well as the other ethnic groups in the class through songs, poems and stories.

e. To participate in field trips to the zoo, museum and sites of historical improtance in Philadelphia. At least three field trips will be planned for each pupil.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

Program evaluators will monitor program, and record whether activities described in objectives a, b, c and d occurred. Project director will report dates on which field trips described in objective e were held.

			1974								1975			
EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director														
2. Evaluation Designed														
3. Proposal Accepted														
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Typed/Proofed														
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: FOLLOW THROUGH (S)

(PBRS # 611-01,02-699**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Leontine D. Scott

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Thomas McNamara, Judith Goodwin, James Welsh, Anne Lukshus, Linda Matthews

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

Summer sessions of the Follow Through program are conducted principally to provide additional time for pupils to profit from the varieties of instructional approach characterizing the program, and specifically as regards reading and mathematics instruction. Summer sessions in addition, however, offer educationally broadening experiences each afternoon - strict academic instruction is limited to the morning - in the form of special instruction in arts and crafts, music, and physical education, and provision for both recreational and educational excursions.

The following process and product goals are considered appropriate for the special summer session:

Process

A. The local evaluation unit will prepare forms for and see to the collection of data from feeder schools regarding the reading and mathematics levels of each child who will attend summer school, prior to the end of the school year.

Product

B. In the first week of the summer session each teacher or aide under the teacher's supervision will administer pre-measures in reading, using selected Instructional Objectives Exchange (IOX) criterion-referenced Reading Tests (80% of the items required for mastery).

Beginning with tests in skill areas comparable to the reading level indicated by the feeder school, the teacher will determine three skill areas of non-mastery for each child as the focus of the summer instruction. At least 70% of the pupils in the program are expected to exhibit mastery in at least two of the three skill areas on post IOX tests at the end of the session.

C. At the beginning of the summer session each teacher will receive information from the feeder school regarding the instructional level of each child in mathematics, as determined by the most recent, regular school year, administration of the Philadelphia Mathematics Levels Tests (PMLT). The focus of the summer instruction will be on skills appropriate to this instructional level. The corresponding level of the PMLT will be administered at the end of the summer session, when it is expected that more than 50% of the pupils will have attained mastery in either the Systems of Numeration or the Rational Number System section of the tests.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

Since total population concern, and, therefore, descriptive statistics are a continuing characteristic of local evaluation of Follow Through in Philadelphia, the carry-over of evaluative approach from the regular year to the summer session is straight forward. The use of a criterion-referenced, mastery, testing approach is, of course, consonant with this stance.

Goal A is a process objective requiring no analysis. The forms for collecting the data will be distributed and response will be monitored.

Goals B and C require direct transformation of data into N's and %'s as stated in the goals.

In addition to providing information related to the two product objectives, the evaluation unit will continue to collect classroom process data on the Classroom Observation Routine (COR), and will also employ a brief open-ended questionnaire to gather teacher satisfaction data.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	X													
2. Evaluation Designed		X												
3. Proposal Accepted		X												
4. Premeasures Administered													X	
5. Monitoring of Project													X	
6. Mid-Measures Administered						N/A								
7. Interim Report						N/A								
8. Monitoring Completed													X	
9. Post-Measures Administered													X	X
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														X
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														X
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														X

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

None

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
TITLE I EVALUATION SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: INSTITUTIONS FOR NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT CHILDREN (S) (**PBRS #**611-05-587)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Lurlene Sweeting **PROJECT EVALUATOR:** William E. Loue, III **INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:** 4

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

Goals, objectives, and measuring devices for the summer program at the participating institutions have been incorporated into the design for the regular school year. Therefore, please refer to that design.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed			✓											
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project												✓	✓	✓
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														✓
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														✓
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														✓
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

None

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: LEARNING CENTERS PROJECT (S) (**PBRS #**611-02-541)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: LORE RASMUSSEN

PROJECT EVALUATOR: THOMAS CLARK

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 4

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

1. To continue the development of teacher or parent producible learning sequences (with concrete components) to be ready for use in schools and the Center by September 1976.

b. To evaluate, refine, alter or discard teaching aids, learning sequences which were in use at the Center in 1975-1976 regular term.

c. To do the investigations necessary to enrich presently available commercial idea collections for expanded offerings in skill development education for the 1976-1977 school year.

d. To develop the first (September-October, 1976) communications items (newsletter, description of first two months' workshop contents) so they can reach the Title I schools early in September.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A report will be submitted by the project director on the Summer Evaluation Form describing the summer activities of the staff.

A narrative summary will be developed by the evaluator, indicating degree of attainment of the specified objectives.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered	N/A													
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered	N/A													
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered	N/A													
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														✓
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														✓
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: MEET THE ARTIST (S) **(PBRS #** 611-02-513 **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Jack Bookbinder
PROJECT EVALUATOR: Arnold Escourt
INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: #4

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

Students who attend at least 14 of the 18 project's sessions will show an increasingly positive attitude toward art and artists, as indicated by a significantly higher ($p<.20$) mean score on a Semantic Differential posttest than on a similar pretest.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

The Semantic Differential will be administered during the first and last sessions. Teachers' records will be used to determine the students who attended at least 14 of the project's 18 sessions. A Fisher "t" test will be used to determine a significant gain from the pretest to the posttest.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered				✓										
5. Monitoring of Project				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report							✓							
8. Monitoring Completed										✓				
9. Post-Measures Administered										✓				
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev												✓		
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

Semantic Differentials to be scored in October 1975 and in May 1975 and programming assistance is required to run an F test using SAS or F4STAT software package.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Motivation (S)

(PBRS # 611-04-555 **)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Rebecca Segal

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Joseph Meade

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. All students will read at least five books during the summer as indicated by project records.

B. Students will improve their reading rate and comprehension at the rate of one month for a month of instruction ay measured by a Standardized test (to be selected).

C. Ninety percent of the students will improve the quality of their written composistions during the project ay measured by teacher grades.

D. Ninety-five percent of the students will significantly improve their math and algebra comprehension as measured by teacher grades.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A. Project records will be reviewed in order to determine the frequency distribution of books read by students.

B. Pre-post test gain score design will be used to evaluate student growth.

C. Teacher grades for the student's first (pre) composition will be compared to grades on the final (post) composistion. A frequency count will be used to determine if 90% of the students have improved. A sign test will be applied to determine significance.

D. Pre-Post test design will be used to assess growth in math and algebra. A frequency count will be used to determine if 95% of the students have improved. A sign test will be applied to determine significance.

	1973						1974							
EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted		✓												
4. Premeasures Administered													AB CD	
5. Monitoring of Project													✓	
6. Mid-Measures Administered													N/A	
7. Interim Report													N/A	
8. Monitoring Completed														✓
9. Post-Measures Administered														AB CD
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														✓
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														✓
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Multimedia Center (S) (**PBRS #** 611-06-615)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Charles McLaughlin

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Thomas Clark

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 4

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. During the summer, the Multimedia Center will prepare for the 1975-1976 school year by (a) accessing new materials, (b) updating the Multimedia Center catalog. (c) maintaining and repairing equipment and audiovisual software, (d) preparing delivery schedules, (e) preparing systems for circulation of materials, and (f) compiling statistical data on usage of the Center's materials. A summer activity log will be maintained by the Multimedia Center coordinator.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a. The coordinator of the Multimedia Center will submit a summary of the summer activities. The information will indicate that the Center is fully prepared to provide all services for the fall term.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered	N/A													
5. Monitoring of Project														✓
6. Mid-Measures Administered	N/A													
7. Interim Report	N/A													
8. Monitoring Completed														✓
9. Post-Measures Administered														a
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														✓
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														✓
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: SCHOOL COMMUNITY COORDINATOR (S) **(PBRS #**611-17-505**)**

PROJECT DIRECTOR: George Green **PROJECT EVALUATOR:** Arnold Escourt **INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY:** 4

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. To prepare a written summarization for each of the School Community Coordinator's performance for the past year, leading to recommendations for the continued improvement of each coordinator.

b. To interview a sampling of key school district personnel and community leaders for the purpose of ascertaining their evaluation of the total SCC project and recommendations for improved performance.

c. To provide direct supervision to the SCC's employed in the summer Head Start program.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

a. A Summer Summarization Form will be developed by the Project Director and his staff. Included in this document will be comments of past performance of the SCC based on observations of the SCC, monthly written reports that had been submitted by the SCC and by the summary records of conferences held by area coordinators with the SCC.

b. An "interview schedule" will be developed by the Project Director and his staff.

c. A summer log of visitations will be kept by the three supervisors, in which summarization of their conferences will be recorded.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project													✓	✓
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														*
8. Monitoring Completed														✓
9. Post-Measures Administered														✓
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														✓
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														✓
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: SUMMER SPECIAL EDUCATION (**PBRS #** 611-05-724)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Marechal-Neil E. Young

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Arnold Escourt

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 2

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. Summer regression of Orthopedically Handicapped students in the project will be controlled to the extent that in each of two areas (academic skills and social skills) 80% of students will maintain their acquired levels of development, as indicated by teachers' end-of-project ratings of students' progress.

B. At least two-thirds of the Orthopedically Handicapped students in the project will receive physical therapy and/or occupational therapy as verified by evaluators' inspection of teacher records.

C. Summer regression of Visually Handicapped students in the project will be controlled to the extent that in each of three areas (academic skills, daily living skills and handcraft activities) 70% of students will maintain their acquired levels of development as indicated by teachers' end-of-project ratings of students' progress.

D. Summer regression of the Trainable Mentally Retarded students in the project will be controlled to the extent that in each of two areas (vocational training skills and social skills) 80% of students will maintain their acquired levels of development as indicated by teachers' end-of-project ratings of students' progress.

E. Summer regression of Emotionally Disturbed Retarded students in the project will be controlled to the extent that in each of two areas (academic skills and social skills) 50% of students will maintain their acquired levels of development as indicated by teachers' end-of-project ratings of students' progress.

F. Summer regression of Hearing Handicapped students in the project will be controlled to the extent that in each of two areas (academic skills and social skills) 50% of students will maintain their acquired levels of development as indicated by teachers' end-of-project ratings of students' progress.

G. The project's job coordinator will visit and/or otherwise contact each student job site to provide counsel to participating students and/or their employers as verified by evaluators' inspection of job coordinators records.

H. At least 75% of the project's Mentally Retarded students employed during the summer months will maintain their jobs as verified by evaluators' inspection of job coordinators records.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

For objectives A, C, D, E, and F, end of project teacher rating checklists will be used to document each pupil's maintenance, progression or regression in each of the academic and non-academic areas specified. The proportion of Orthopedically Handicapped, Visually Handicapped, Trainable Mentally Retarded, Emotionally Disturbed Retarded and Hearing Handicapped students maintaining or enhancing their skill levels will be computed and compared to specified criteria levels as stated in the objectives.

For objective B, weekly checklists will be maintained by project teachers indicating the number of hours of physical and/or occupational therapy which each Orthopedically Handicapped student was provided. The proportion of Orthopedically Handicapped students receiving therapy during the project will be computed and compared to the specified criteria level.

For objective G, the job-coordinator will maintain a daily log of job sites contacted. Logs will identify each job site contacted, number of students employed, presence or absence of problems at each job site. Weekly and overall totals will be prepared by the job coordinator and verified by the project evaluator.

For objective H, and end of project checklist will be prepared by the job cordinator to document the job status (employed-unemployed) of each of the Mentally Retarded pupils participating in the project. The proportion of students employed will be computed and compared to the criteria level stated in the objective.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered														
5. Monitoring of Project														
6. Mid-Measures Administered														
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered														
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														✓
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative √=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: WALNUT CENTER (S) (**PBRS #** 611-01-517)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Frances Becker

PROJECT EVALUATOR: William E. Loue III

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 3

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

a. To provide day care services in an enriched environment for children: including food services, field trips, various visual aids, reading materials, manipulative materials, play equipment, and social activities.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

Records of average daily attendance at the center will be reported and summarized. In addition, documentation of services provided will be reported by the director, using the Summer Evaluation Summary.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed			✓											
3. Proposal Accepted			✓											
4. Premeasures Administered	N/A													
5. Monitoring of Project													✓	
6. Mid-Measures Administered	N/A													
7. Interim Report														
8. Monitoring Completed														
9. Post-Measures Administered													A	
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev														✓
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed														*
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														*

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, MAasuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

Evaluation Service Form

PROJECT: Comprehensive Reading Program
Intensive Reading for Secondary Students (R)

(PBRS #Pending)

PROJECT DIRECTOR: District Reading Managers & Philip Pitis (activity manager)

PROJECT EVALUATOR: District Research Associates

INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY: 1

GOALS TO BE ASSESSED

A. All students below the 16 percentile on the Junior High School level will receive five additional periods of Reading per week in classes which average 15 pupils.

B. All students below the 16 percentile on the Senior and Technical High School level will receive three additional periods of Reading per week in classes which average 15 pupils.

C. All students between the 15-33 percentile on the Junior High School level will receive five additional periods of Reading per week in classes which average 20 pupils.

D. All students between the 16-33 percentile on the Senior and Technical High School level will receive three additional periods of Reading per week in classes which average 20 pupils.

E. Each school, through the cooperative efforts of the Principal and the existing Reading Teachers in the school organization, will prepare a plan of implementation that will take into account facilities, instructional materials, scheduling changes, teaching personnel, and other unique problems that will need to be taken into account in order to plan for the most effective implementation of the project.

F.

Students who are admitted to the program by October 1, and who attend school at least 85% of the time during the first two report periods will maintain or increase their percentile rankings on the reading subtests of the CAT over their 1975 rankings.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES (DESIGN)

A/E. The Office of Curriculum and Instruction, through its Title I Reading Director, will be responsible for the monitoring of all planned programs throughout the 1975-1976 school year.

F. A frequency count of the number of participants who attain the goal will be made using the 1975 CAT as a pre measure and the 1976 CAT as a post measure. A similar technique will be used to compare pupil growth on an Informal Reading Inventory between October 1975 and May 1976.

EVALUATION MILESTONES	JULY	AUG.	SEPT	OCT	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG
1. Conference with Project Director	✓													
2. Evaluation Designed	✓													
3. Proposal Accepted	✓													
4. Premeasures Administered	1975 CAT	A B C D	E	F										
5. Monitoring of Project			✓											
6. Mid-Measures Administered	N/A													
7. Interim Report								✓						
8. Monitoring Completed												✓ E		
9. Post-Measures Administered								CAT F			F			
10. Final Report Prepared Drafts Reviewed Modifications Made/Rev													✓	
11. Preliminary Final Draft Taped/Proofed													✓	
12. Printing Arranged/ Distributed														✓

*=Tentative ✓=Firm N/A=Not Applicable Letter=Goal, Measuring Device, Sample, etc.

EVALUATION SERVICES REQUIRED FROM DIVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES